

J. Murphy

VOLUME XV.

[Fourth]

NUMBER 9.

THE

RELIGIOUS MONITOR,

AND

EVANGELICAL REPORTORY:

DEVOTED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORMATION,

AS SET FORTH IN THE

Formularies of the Westminster Divines,

AND OTHERWISE SET BY THE

GENERAL SYNOD OF NORTH AMERICA.

NEW YORK: PUBLISHED BY J. MURPHY, 152 NASSAU ST.

Those who are fond of the Bible and who wish to see the principles of the Reformation set forth in the Formularies of the Westminster Divines, and who wish to see the principles of the Reformation set forth in the Formularies of the Westminster Divines, will find this work of great value. Jan. 1, 18.

ALBANY.

PUBLISHED BY J. MURPHY & SONS,

152 NASSAU ST.

1854

REVISED MONITOR

FOR THE

USE OF THE

NAVY

OF THE

UNITED STATES

OF AMERICA

1864

NEW YORK

Published by the

NAVY DEPARTMENT

WASHINGTON

THE
RELIGIOUS MONITOR,
AND
EVANGELICAL REPOSITORY.

FEBRUARY, 1839.

ART. I. *A Review of the Associate Presbyterian Magazine.*

It is known to our readers, that, during the past summer, a Periodical was started in this city, entitled THE ASSOCIATE PRESBYTERIAN MAGAZINE, and "under the immediate superintendence of the Rev. P. Bullions, D. D." as EDITOR. The manifest design of this work was to vindicate the course of certain brethren, who had been subjected to the censures of the church, and, to assail and vilify the members and proceedings of those judicatories, which had any agency in the infliction of these censures. It will appear in the sequel how far the Editor has succeeded in the execution of either part of this design.

We have already notified our readers of the estimate, in which we hold this production, so far as it has yet made its appearance. Correspondents have also expressed their views in relation to it. And perhaps it may, by some, be thought, that any further notice of it would be giving it an importance, of which it is utterly undeserving. But others have suggested, that, although the work carries with it its own antidote, especially in the plentifulness and coarseness of its abuse, yet possibly a few well-meaning but uninformed people may be deceived and misled by it; and besides, that we are under some obligation to substantiate the assertions, which we have made respecting the nature of its contents.

We felt, at one time, some doubts of the propriety of reviewing the contents of this Magazine very closely, as the necessary effect would be to blast in a great measure the reputation of its editor. But these doubts have been removed, partly, by a declaration made to us by a special friend of the editor, that if there were false statements in the Magazine, "duty to the cause of truth required that they should be exposed," thereby intimating, that the claims of truth were paramount to all considerations of tenderness for the reputation of one, who had forfeited the regard of all its friends;—and, partly, by meditating on the conduct of our Divine Master in relation to the Scribes and Phari-

sees. His expose of the character and actions of those men, and which had the tendency to destroy their reputation with the more serious and reflecting part of the community, was not made simply on *their* account, or with any view to injure *them*, but only for the sake of truth, and on account of the immortal souls that were seduced and in danger of being eternally destroyed by their hypocritical representations and practices. And doubtless it was for the same reason, that the Apostle Paul exposed, as he did, certain characters in his day.

In addition to these considerations, the editor of the Magazine has arrogantly challenged us, in the No. for December, to a performance of the task we have now undertaken. He says "it is remarkable," although the Magazine has been more than four months before the public, that "neither we nor any of our correspondents have attempted to 'expose the glaring falsehoods and misrepresentations' in which it is said to abound:" And then in the language of defiance exultingly exclaims:—"We know that the assertions of the Monitor never can be substantiated, and that our statements never can be falsified in any material point."—Whatever effect, therefore, the following Review may have on the reputation of the editor of the Magazine, it must be ascribed, not to us, but to himself. Although he has made several personal attacks upon us, still we would willingly spare him, did not the cause of truth and the welfare of those whom his work is misleading require this service at our hands.

Whether Dr. Bullions be the real writer of all that appears as editorial in his pages, we undertake not to say; but, that he is the *responsible* author, he will not himself deny. The public holds him as such; and as such we claim the right to denominate and treat him. And as the chief part of his work, on which we intend to animadvert, is called "Remarks," &c. to avoid the too frequent use of his name, we will, with due respect, style him the *Remarker*.

Having made these preliminary statements, we commence our Review, by subjecting to the test of truth the leading article contained in the first number of the aforesaid Magazine, entitled "*Remarks on the decisions of the Associate Synod respecting the Presbytery of Albany.*" After stating, in a short introductory paragraph, that those decisions were "excessively arbitrary and presumptuous," "manifest a disregard to truth and honesty," and "show that men professing godliness will trample under foot all the claims of justice and equity," the Rev. Remarker says:—"Our readers may have learned from the minutes of Synod, that that court undertook to suspend from the exercise of their office and from the communion of the church, no fewer than six of its members, because they refused to submit to an unjust decision respecting the Presbytery of Albany." (p. 9.) In this sentence there are several deviations from matters of fact. The Synod did not simply "undertake to suspend," but *did actually suspend* the persons referred to, viz: Messrs. Stark, Bullions and Blair, ministers, and Messrs. Edwards, Crookshanks and Gilmore, ruling elders. But the Synod did not suspend them "because they refused to submit to an *unjust* decision." This allegation is highly slanderous. Nor is it true that "that court suspended *six* of its *members*." The editor of the Magazine knows well, that, as soon as the roll was called at the opening of Synod, an objection was made to *his* sitting as a member of the court, on the ground of his having been suspended from the exercise of the ministry by the Presbytery of Albany, and he also knows, that that objection

was sustained by the court. Indeed, none of the six properly speaking were ever recognised as regular members of the court; for they were not allowed, according to a resolution adopted, "to take any part in the business of Synod till the roll was made out:" and when the roll was finally made out, their names were omitted. How then can they be called "members of that court?"

The Remarker proceeds, same page, to say:—"The first notice taken of this subject in the minutes of Synod is in the following words, viz: 'Information has been given to this Synod, that there are reports from two bodies claiming to be the Presbytery of Albany.' This is not the first notice taken of this subject in the minutes of Synod. For on the page of the minutes immediately preceding that from which he quotes, we have this record: "Notices were also given by two members claiming to be clerks of the Presbytery of Albany, that Dr. P. Bullions was suspended from the exercise of the ministry; Messrs. Martin and Campbell from their seats in Presbytery." Why does the Remarker quote from the minute of *Thursday*, as containing "the first notice of this subject," when he knows that the subject referred to was introduced and discussed at some length on *Wednesday*, immediately after the opening of Synod? Throughout the whole history of the case as exhibited in the pages of the Magazine, there is a studied concealment of the fact that Messrs. Campbell and Martin were "suspended from their seats in Presbytery," by that disorderly body which undertook to act as the Presbytery of Albany. It would never answer to have this fact, as recorded in the above minute, appear in the Magazine; for its appearance there, besides doing other mischief, would spoil one of the prettiest and most literary paragraphs in the whole book, and which is expressed in these terms:—"It is mentioned in Mosheim's History, that when Luther understood that the Pope was about to launch the thunder of excommunication at his devoted head, he judged it prudent to withdraw himself voluntarily, that he might thus render the bull of ejection a blow in the air. The [pretended] Presbytery of Albany in this instance thought it advisable to imitate the example of the great Reformer. When they perceived that this corrupt Synod were likely to imitate the example of his Holiness, they thought it advisable to withdraw from them voluntarily, and thus render their suspension a blow in the air—an exercise of authority without an object." (p. 27.) Now, if the Remarker, instead of concealing, had published the fact above noticed, his readers would not have failed to perceive a *rivalship* in regard to the honor of imitating "the great Reformer:" For Messrs. Campbell and Martin also, it seems, were imitators of that distinguished personage; for when the above mentioned disorderly body, "in imitation of his Holiness," were about to pass the resolution offered by Dr. P. Bullions for their "suspension from their seats in Presbytery," "they thought it advisable to withdraw from them voluntarily, and thus render their suspension a blow in the air—an exercise of authority without an object." But we shall be obliged to notice this matter more particularly hereafter.

On page 10, we meet with the following assertions respecting Mr. Webster's pamphlet:—"It has fully come to light, that the pamphlet was a conjunct concern between him and members of the Presbytery of Albany, and some of the members of the Presbytery of Cambridge." "The most active members of Presbytery [Albany] were deeply implicated in Mr. Webster's publication." "He then showed him a com-

munication in the hand-writing of one of the members of the Presbytery of Albany, in nearly the same words in which it was afterwards published in his pamphlet, in which reference was made to certain members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge, and to a certain professor of divinity, as being privy to and concerned in the same work." "This infamous pamphlet was proved to be false, and its authors proved to be false and malicious slanderers in a court of justice."

These assertions betray a great recklessness in regard of truth. It is not true, that Mr. Webster's pamphlet was a "conjunct concern" between him and members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge; and consequently no such thing has "fully come to light." The only light pretended to glimmers forth, it seems, from a "communication" which the late Mr. Irvine addressed to Mr. Webster sometime prior to the publication of his pamphlet. In that letter Mr. Irvine mentioned certain things which "common fame" charged upon Mr. Stark, and which Mr. Webster afterwards published in his pamphlet as "common fame." This is the sum total of the "light," which has led, or rather misled, like an *ignis fatuus*, the Remarker to make the above assertions. From this data who can honestly say, that Mr. Irvine had a "conjunct concern" in the publication of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, as one of its "authors," especially as it can be proved that he was not even aware that the thing was in progress till he saw it in print? But at the same time his letter proves that the charges taken from it did not originate with Mr. Webster: and hence, whether true or false, Mr. W. declared that he published them only as "common fame."

But further, it is not true that Mr. Irvine's letter contained any reference to "a certain professor of divinity, as being privy to and concerned in the same work." Mr. Webster has assured us that there was no reference to any professor of divinity, in any shape or way whatever, in the letter in question. And as it is supposed that Professor Beveredge is the person intended by the Remarker, we are authorized by him to use the following disclaimer made in a letter to us:—"I was so far from corresponding with any one about Mr. Webster's pamphlet, or furnishing any materials for it, or advising, or encouraging it, that I had not the least knowledge that such a publication was intended, till I saw a copy of it, sent to another individual."

Nor is it true that the letter in question refers to "certain members of the Presbyteries of Albany and Cambridge, as being privy to and concerned in the same work." That letter it appears, does mention the names of a *single* member in each of the Presbyteries named, but not in a way to identify them in any respect as conjunct authors with Mr. W. in the production of his pamphlet. And all this the editor himself of the Magazine very well knows, as it can be proved, that he has stated to more than one individual, that he believed Mr. Webster's pamphlet to be wholly his own production. Is it not amazing, then, that he should publish to the world the assertions above quoted, together with many others which reiterate the same unfounded accusation?

But again, it is not true that Mr. Webster's pamphlet has been "proved to be false in a court of justice." For there was no testimony taken to prove any such thing. The only witness that was sworn in the case, was the one that testified to Mr. Stark's good character and standing, although at the very time he was giving his testimony, Mr. Stark was under a sentence of suspension by the Associate Synod, on

charges deeply involving both his moral and ministerial character. The pamphlet, therefore, could not have been "*proved* to be *false* in a court of justice;" and the most that can be said of the matter is, that Mr. W. did not appear in court to *prove* it to be *true*, but let judgment go against him by *default*. The editor, therefore, had no just ground for this assertion; and much less for the other connected with it, that the "*AUTHORS*" of the pamphlet were "*PROVED* to be false and malicious slanderers in a court of justice."

After this plain statement of facts, in opposition to the groundless and injurious assertions of the Magazine, our readers will hardly be prepared for the following repetition of the same calumnies, and with increased *virus*, on page 12:—"The method pursued by the Presbytery was exactly such as might have been expected from interested persons, and who were themselves concerned in committing the offences on which they were to sit in judgment. Those members of the Presbytery who had been concerned in the pamphlet, came forward as witnesses, each to prove his own slanders, and after having done so, they sat in judgment on their own testimony. In this manner they proved their own slanders to their own satisfaction, and made such decisions as they might judge most advantageous in the premises. The Presbytery next proceeded to construct a libel against Mr. Stark, out of the slanders contained in Mr. Webster's pamphlet, and in which it is now certain that many of themselves were deeply concerned," &c. &c. A more libellous paragraph perhaps never was written; and if the editor, at the time, did not know that he was publishing to the world one of the grossest of libels, it will be all the better for himself in that day, when it will be "rendered unto every one according to his deeds."

Before proceeding further, it may be proper also to state, that Mr. Irvine never attended a meeting of Presbytery after the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet came to be acted on by that court. Sickness and death prevented his attendance: consequently he had nothing to do with any of the Presbytery's proceedings in that case; although the contrary is insinuated, and the uninformed reader is left to conjecture that he had the principal agency in those proceedings.

But to proceed, on the same page 10, the Remarker says:—"As the most active members of Presbytery were deeply implicated in Mr. Webster's publication, they endeavored to do all they could for him, and passed several resolutions in his favor. Among other things, they voted 'That the institution of legal proceedings by Mr. Stark against Chauncey Webster, is altogether unjustifiable, wholly subversive of the first principles of church order, and in direct opposition to the authority of Christ and of the Apostle Paul.' But as the Presbytery did not appear to be able to show any scriptural authority for the above curious vote, Mr. Stark did not pay any attention to it."—The "vote" here ascribed to the Presbytery is purely a fiction. They voted no such thing. The following is the resolution voted by Presbytery on that occasion: "*Resolved*, That it is censurable according to the word of God and the Discipline of this church, for a minister of the gospel to enter a civil suit against a member of his own communion for a supposed injury to his moral character, without first having submitted the matter to the adjudication of the appropriate church court"—and the minutes of Presbytery add: "Against this decision Mr. Stark protested for reasons to be given in, and Mr. Bullions joined him in his protest." This protest, with the "*conjunct*" Reasons of Messrs. Stark and Bullions

came before the next Synod. Now, however, Dr. Bullions sees fit to change both the language and character of the Resolution against which he protested, and attempts to father a thing of his own creation upon the Presbytery, and then sneers at it as "a curious vote!"

Besides the Resolution just named, the Presbytery, on that occasion, passed but *one* more, which bore on the case of Mr. Webster; and that one was moved by Dr. Bullions himself, and is as follows: "*Resolved*, That a committee be appointed to draw up a libel against Mr. Webster." Yet in the face of these facts, the man who has chosen for his motto the sacred words—*Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just*—has published, as above quoted, that the Presbytery at the meeting referred to, passed several resolutions in favor of Mr. Webster; and then publishes a *fictional* resolution as one of them!

The next thing that engages the attention of the Remarker, is Mr. Webster's so-called "paper of retraction." He asserts, and repeats the assertion some twenty times, that Mr. Webster gave Mr. Stark a paper, in which he acknowledged that the charges made against Mr. Stark in his pamphlet, were wholly "unwarranted and unfounded." It is scarcely necessary to waste time in pointing out the falsity of this assertion, as it is very much doubted whether any person conversant with the history of the case believes it. And, indeed, whether even charity "that thinketh no evil," can allow that the editor himself believes it, is a nice problem.

Messrs. Campbell and Smart, who were present, and the only persons present, at the time the paper in question was put in the possession of Mr. Stark, have both declared under oath at the bar of the Synod, that Mr. Webster gave the "paper" to Mr. Stark with great "reluctance," and not till after Mr. Stark had "pledged his sacred honor that he would make no use of it whatever, and that it would be as safe in his hands as in Mr. Webster's own pocket;" and both these witnesses also testified, that they considered the "paper," after it was given to Mr. Stark, to be still under "negociation," and that "additions or alterations might still be made, at the suggestion of either party, as they had come to no agreement." In particular, we consider the following Interrogatory, with Mr. Smart's answer, as putting this matter forever to rest with all reflecting minds: "*Question*. Does the witness consider Mr. Webster's refusal to give the paper to Mr. Stark, satisfactory evidence that said paper was not assented to by Mr. Webster? *Answer*. I do, and for this reason, that the object of this paper was to stop civil process on the part of Mr. Stark against Mr. Webster; and I consider, that if Mr. Webster had made up his mind to abide by the contents of that paper, he had no reason to fear any improper use of it; because no improper use could be made of it. The reluctance with which he gave the paper satisfied my mind, that he feared, that, in the progress of the suit, a use might be made to his prejudice of a paper to which he had not fully assented; so that he did not give Mr. Stark the paper until he considered himself sufficiently secured against any contingency that might arise." (*See Narrative published by the Presbytery of Albany, p. 7.*)

In addition to all this, the minutes of the Presbytery which refer to this matter, most completely contradict the Remarker's assertions. Let the following extracts be carefully perused and the truth will abundantly appear: "The latter, [Mr. Webster] having a difficulty in relation to

the concession to be made to promote this end, [stopping the civil suit,] it was *Resolved*, That Messrs. Smart and Campbell be appointed to confer with him in order to remove this difficulty.—After conferring with Mr. Webster and calling upon Mr. Stark, the committee returned, and not having fully accomplished their object, it was agreed that Presbytery adjourn till to-morrow morning at eight o'clock." And in the minutes of the meeting held next morning the following record occurs: "Mr. Webster having declared his inability to make the concession required by Mr. Stark, Presbytery agreed to proceed," &c. The above minutes were framed by Mr. Smart, one of the committee, and were assented to by all parties, and even by Dr. Bullions himself. These minutes show that Mr. Webster had a difficulty about the extent of the concessions required by Mr. Stark—that a committee was appointed to endeavor to remove this difficulty—that said committee reported that they had not fully accomplished their object, that is, had not fully removed the difficulty from Mr. Webster's mind—that the matter was then left over, for reflection, till next morning—and that at the opening of the Presbytery next morning, Mr. Webster declared his inability to make the concessions required. Now, all these facts were well known to Dr. Bullions, and yet he publishes over, and over, and over again, that Mr. Webster *retracted* the charges made in his pamphlet against Mr. Stark, as "unwarranted and unfounded." And on this most palpable untruth are founded many of those slanders, which he has published against the Presbytery of Albany.

In relation to this "paper," the Remarker further states:—"He [Mr. Webster] afterwards affected to deny that this paper contained a full and complete retraction of the slander, but care had been taken to have exact copies of it made before witnesses, so that its contents can easily be ascertained. But the simple fact, that Mr. Webster seized the paper and tore it up, will satisfy every candid person, that it must have contained something that he was then desirous to conceal." The *truth*, however, is, that Mr. Webster never denied, nor "affected to deny," nor wished to deny, or even "conceal," that the paper in question contained a full retraction. This he has always admitted. But he denies and always has denied, that he gave that paper to Mr. Stark *as his retraction*, or in any other sense, than *as a paper still under negotiation*, and even that with reluctance, lest some improper use might be made of it. The above assertion, therefore, of the Remarker, is a mere *expedient* resorted to, in order to cover over the disgrace of the man, who multiplied copies of the said "paper" and distributed them among his friends, after "pledging his sacred honor that he would make no use of it whatever," and by means of such a pledge obtaining the possession of the paper in question!

As the next sentence is a tolerably fair specimen of the Doctor's logic and adds to the "light," through the medium of which he sees so clearly that Mr. Webster's pamphlet was a "conjunct concern," we will take the pains to transcribe it. Here it is:—"And the fact that he [Mr. W.] was permitted to do this [tear up the paper] by the Presbytery, without any expression of their disapprobation, has left an irresistible impression on the minds of all honest men, who are acquainted with these transactions, that the Presbytery must have been concerned in the infamous publication so often mentioned." Indeed! because the Presbytery did not hinder Mr. Webster, or censure him, for destroying a paper of his own, a paper which they had nothing to do with, and

which Mr. Stark had "pledged his sacred honor," the evening before, to make no use of, forsooth, "an irresistible impression is made on the minds of all honest men, that the Presbytery must have been concerned in the infamous publication!" One thing, however, is certain, that the tearing up of that paper made "an irresistible impression" on some minds, that the act was prompted by a strong feeling of indignation at what was considered *perfidious* if not *treacherous* conduct on the part of the individual who had been using that paper in defiance of a solemn pledge given to the contrary!

After making the above very plain and logical deduction to the injury of the Presbytery, as he supposes, the Dr. thus proceeds with his history:—"The Presbytery then proceeded to draw up a libel against Mr. Webster for publishing his slanderous pamphlet, and afterwards found the charges brought against him in the libel to be relevant. That is, they decided that the offences laid to his charge in the libel, and which it was proved that he had actually committed, were sinful and censurable. But instead of censuring him for his sins and offences, the Presbytery, in open violation of the laws of God, and in direct opposition to all the rules of church discipline, allowed him and assisted him to bring testimony to attempt to prove what he had already declared to be 'unwarranted and unfounded'—and by so doing, determined that it was lawful for him to justify his sins. Mr. Stark objected to this proceeding as a violation of all the laws of God and man," &c. Now for the truth.—It was the Dr. himself, after the affair of the "retraction" was dismissed, who moved and advocated the drawing up of the libel against Mr. Webster; it was the Dr. who framed the libel; it was the Dr. who, in opposition to the judgment of some others, maintained and carried the relevancy of all the charges in the libel; it was the Dr. who insisted on Mr. Webster's being put on *trial*, and either prove his statements, or be censured for making them; and it was the Dr. who, as Moderator *pro tem.* signed the citations for Mr. Webster's witnesses, and thus, it seems, "allowed him and assisted him to bring testimony to attempt to prove what he had already declared to be 'unwarranted and unfounded'—and by so doing, determined that it was lawful for him to justify his sins!" We do not mean to say that Dr. Bullions did all this alone; only, that he took the lead in this affair of the libel, and gave his hearty consent to that very procedure, which he imputes to the Presbytery as "a violation of all the laws of God and man."

But in the above extract there are two very gross departures from the truth—*First*, in representing the charges contained in the libel against Mr. W. as *proved*, before any proof was taken in the case, or in other words, before Mr. W. was put on his *trial*: finding the charges *relevant*, that is, *censurable if proven*, is made synonymous with actually *proving* them: an easy process this whereby to convict a person of crime!—And *Second*, in asserting that the Presbytery "determined that it was lawful for Mr. W. to justify his sins;" which assertion is again repeated on the next page—"The Presbytery agreed that Mr. W. should go on and justify his sin." Any person will see, without having another word said on the subject, that this assertion is destitute of even the semblance of truth.

In close connection with the above, we find the following very *charitable* remarks: "By these infamous proceedings, Mr. Stark became fully satisfied, that the design of the Presbytery in trying Mr. Webster, wa

merely to do what they could for him, to prevent the truth from being known, and to conceal their own share in this nefarious business. He therefore interfered no further with the Presbytery than to protest against their illegal proceedings, and they agreed that Mr. W. should go on to justify his sin, in publishing his slanderous falsehoods, and to prove those things to be true that he had declared to be unfounded." (p. 12.) But here we will merely notice, with the view to correct it, the statement, that "Mr. Stark interfered no further with the Presbytery than to protest against their illegal proceedings." Let the reader contrast with this statement, the fact that Mr. Stark was present during almost the whole time of Mr. Webster's trial, and took a most active part in it, such as cross-examining witnesses, explaining testimony, &c., and that it was not till near the close of the trial, at least till all the matters in which he had a personal interest, were disposed of, that he left the Presbytery and "interfered no further with them," assigning also as his reason, not that which is here insinuated, but *sickness*. This is confirmed by a note which he addressed to the Clerk on that occasion, and which begins thus:—"Rev. Sir—In consequence of continued indisposition, I find myself under the necessity of being absent from the Presbytery, and have thought it best to return home."

From the libel against Mr. Webster, the Remarker proceeds to notice the one against Mr. Stark, which "libel," he says, "the Presbytery constructed out of the slanders contained in Mr. Webster's pamphlet," (p. 12) and a little afterwards, "The libel was confessedly founded on Mr. Webster's slanderous pamphlet."* Now this is so far from being true, that the libel was chiefly "constructed out of the slanders contained" in Mr. Stark's Anonymous Pamphlets, and was "confessedly founded" on those "slanderous" pamphlets. (*See the Libel as given in the Narrative published by the Presbytery of Albany.*)

This libel against Mr. Stark was referred by the Presbytery to the Synod for trial; concerning which latter court, the Remarker is pleased to hold the following language:—"The Synod which met in Philadelphia, in May, 1836, consisted of about a fifth part of all the members, and so many of these were implicated in the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, that there would not have been a quorum without them. Yet some of these persons, though so deeply implicated, were the principal actors in the indecent transactions of that Synod. All their proceedings seemed designed to screen the Presbytery from well-merited contempt. Nothing more unprincipled or unjust can well be imagined, &c." (p. 13.) The Synod thus blackly characterized, was composed of twenty-one ministers and eleven ruling elders. The Book of Discipline says:—"Any six ministers from different Presbyteries, with such elders as shall be present, shall be competent to form a Synod, and to proceed to business." And yet, according to the Remarker, so many of the above thirty-two members "were implicated in the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, that there would not have been a quorum without them!" As there were four ministers who voted in Mr. Stark's favor, it would seem that all the rest, save perhaps one, were "actors" in "indecent transactions," and "were deeply implicated in the affair of Mr. Webster's pamphlet!" Now, will it be deemed too harsh, to

* After the severe and harsh epithets employed by the Remarker against Mr. Webster's pamphlet, Mr. Stark ought not to think it uncharitable nor ungenerous, were Mr. Webster's defence before the Presbytery of Albany to be made public, together with **ALL THE TESTIMONY** taken in the case.

use the Remarker's own language as descriptive of his own conduct, in thus lampooning a court to which he had solemnly vowed respect and obedience?—"Nothing more unprincipled or unjust can well be imagined."

After publishing the "first charge" in the libel against Mr. Stark, and which charges him with the authorship of "certain anonymous pamphlets," the editor declares, that "*all* the other charges in the libel depended on it." (p. 13.) But this is not the fact. For any person, by referring to the libel, will find Mr. Stark charged with "slandering Mr. Webster in the *Christian Magazine*," and also with "lying" in denying the authorship of the "K. paper." These charges were as weighty as any in the libel; but they had no connection whatever with the "anonymous pamphlets."

But a still more fearful departure from truth immediately follows: "However incredible it may appear, this Synod found the libel proven in the absence of all testimony." (p. 13.) This is repeated, (same p.) "The Synod convicted him in the absence of all testimony." Again (same p.) "The Synod did in effect suspend Mr. Stark—for offences which they had not even attempted to prove." And on page 19, we find it again repeated: "The Synod found it [the libel] proven without any evidence." On this *outrageous conduct*, the Remarker, his moral sensibilities being deeply wounded, thus comments:—"Surely the court that could do this must have been given up to the most fearful infatuation;" and such conduct he pronounces "an outrage on all decency, and perfect mockery of all that men regard as sacred and holy." Some of our readers may now be ready to say, surely this charge against the Synod which is so often repeated, and on which the Reverend Remarker thus feelingly moralizes, must be based on solid truth. This, however, is far from being the case. The charge is utterly groundless. The Synod committed no such "outrage" as that alleged. This is manifest from the following extract taken from the published minutes of that Court:—"Proceeded with the business left unfinished in the forenoon sitting, viz: the libel against Mr. Stark, Mr. Clokey in the chair. The proof of the 1st charge in the libel, viz: 'writing and publishing pamphlets and letters of a mendacious, calumnious, and ribaldish character' was produced, viz: the recorded testimony of the Rev. P. Bullions, as taken by the Presbytery of Albany, on the trial of C. Webster, in presence of Mr. Stark. Also a note in the pamphlet, entitled 'The case of Dr. Bullions fairly stated, in corroboration of which the written testimony of the Rev. P. Campbell, and Messrs. John Law and Andrew Kirkpatrick, as taken in the case above mentioned, in the presence of Mr. Stark, was admitted and read as testimony.'" (Minutes of Synod for 1836, p. 34.)

Nor was the above all the *testimony* that was used on the trial of the libel in question: The "internal evidence" contained in the "pamphlets themselves" was exhibited to the court;—to establish the truth of a certain part of the libel, the testimony of Messrs. Irvine and Martin and Mrs. E. Wright, was also produced;—the "*Christian Magazine*" and a written admission of Mr. Stark proved another point in the libel;—and other points were proved by reference to the "minutes" of Synod, of the Commission at Salem, and of the Presbytery of Cambridge. And yet, the Editor of the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine* bewails the "infatuation" of the Synod in "finding the libel proven in the absence of all testimony!" The reader will now be able to judge

for himself, how much credit is due to the oft repeated assertions of the Magazine; and also, whether the editor's *comment* on the Synod's conduct, as quoted above, might not be used very appropriately to illustrate the character and import of his own conduct. But we forbear.

Passing over some other misstatements, we will now proceed to notice what is said in the Magazine respecting the late decision of Synod in "the case of the Albany Presbytery." But that the reader may have a better understanding of the subject, it must be premised, that shortly before the meeting of Synod in 1836, Mr. Stark sent in a paper to the Presbytery in which he absolutely refused to be tried by the Presbytery on the libel mentioned above, and protested against the Presbytery's "interfering with him in any way;" but after the Synod of 1837 had removed the suspension under which the Synod of 1836 had laid him, in order to a "review of that deed," he attended a meeting of Presbytery and claimed his seat; but was refused, for this reason, among others, that he had declined the authority of the Presbytery; and also when asked to withdraw his paper of declinature he refused to do it. Against the decision of Presbytery refusing Mr. Stark a seat, he together with Messrs. Bullions and Blair protested and appealed to the next meeting of Synod, and subsequently gave in their reasons of protest, which were answered by a committee.

But about a month before the meeting of the Synod to which they had appealed, the protestors did by management, and in the absence of the other ministerial members, thrust Mr. Stark into the seat from which he had been excluded. This, with the accompanying circumstances, occasioned that division in the Presbytery, with which all our readers, it is presumed, are more or less acquainted. At the last meeting of Synod, then, the question came up for consideration, which of these divisions should be regarded and held as the Associate Presbytery of Albany? And this question was finally decided in the words following, viz:

"Whereas it appears that Mr. Stark had been justly excluded from a seat in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, on the ground of his having declined their authority, which declinature he had also refused to withdraw; whereas the protestors against his exclusion, by withdrawing their protest, left his exclusion confirmed; and they had no right to review or reverse the deed of Presbytery; and whereas Mr. Stark's illegal admission to a seat vitiated all their proceedings: Therefore

Resolved, That the party of which he was a member is not the Associate Presbytery of Albany, but was irregular in their constitution and all their acts null and void.

"And whereas Dr. P. Bullions was under process for scandal, he had no right to accuse; and therefore the decision excluding from seats in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, Messrs. Martin and Campbell is null and void: Therefore

Resolved, That the body, of which Messrs. Martin & Campbell are members, is truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany."

In relation to the above decision the Remarker observes:—"The first and principal ground on which this decision rests is, that Mr. Stark had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany, and which declinature he had also refused to withdraw," and then adds, that "both of those statements are untrue." He begins with the former, and denies that "Mr. Stark had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany," adding:—"The paper dated 12th May, 1836, which he gave into that Presbytery was not a declinature."

This paper was published by the Presbytery of Albany in their "Narrative"; and every person who has read it can form his own opinion whether it was a declinature or not. The following are a few extracts from it:—"I hereby give notice that I protest against their [the Presbytery's] interfering with me in any way, and that I shall hold as null and void and of no account whatever decisions they may make."—"The conduct of the Presbytery in the matter of Mr. Webster's trial, was such as necessarily to destroy their character for disinterestedness, impartiality and fair dealing."—"To me it appears quite evident, that a court that could do this, could not act on the principles of truth and righteousness, and it would be perfectly idle to expect justice from it. If I were as innocent as my master himself, I could expect nothing else than to be condemned by such a court, provided it might suit its policy. Therefore a trial before such a court is, in my humble opinion, a very needless formality."—"I cannot honor the Presbytery so far as to be tried by them, till the Rev. Messrs. Campbell and Martin, James Geery, John Duncan, Mrs. Wright and Dr. Buckham, and all the others concerned, shall be brought to trial, and be made either to retract or establish their slanders, [the things they stated under oath.]"—"This fact alone, is, in my opinion, quite sufficient to destroy my confidence in the Presbytery."—"When church courts depart so far from the course of duty, they lose all just claim to that respect, to which otherwise they are entitled." Of such bearing and tenor is the whole paper, which winds up after the fashion of a genuine declinature; the writer charging the Presbytery with a *departure* from the principles of the Associate Church, and declaring his intention not to follow them. His words are: "For my own part I intend firmly to adhere to these principles [of the Associate Church] and resolutely to oppose every departure from them, and therefore, I cannot in *any way* countenance the Presbytery in a course of backsliding, which if sanctioned must destroy the principles and discipline of the church."

ANDREW STARK."

This paper was accompanied with no appeal to the Synod, or notice of his transferring his cause to that court for trial, as is usual in all cases of allowable declinatures, where some special reasons exist for the removal of causes from the lower to the superior court. Let this fact be borne in mind, and we may safely appeal to the candor of every enlightened person, if the above paper be not a real declination of the authority of the Presbytery of Albany?

But the Remarker says, "Mr. Stark always denied that the paper in question was a declinature." (p. 12.) Let Mr. Stark's own words on the subject be heard, and it will be seen that he *did* regard that paper, if not in form at least in fact, to be a declinature. In his published Letter to his congregation, shortly after the paper in question was written, he says:—"I thought I could no longer place any confidence in them, (the Presbytery.) Accordingly, when they cited me to attend the meeting at which they said they were to try their libel, I gave them notice that I could not *countenance* them in *any way* till their own conduct should be investigated." Why then did he come back to the Presbytery, asking a seat, before their conduct was investigated? But again, in that strange communication, which he addressed to the Synod of 1836, (a sentence from which was commented on at the late meeting of Synod,) and which bears palpable marks of its being intended as a *finale* he thus writes:—"The subscriber, therefore, petitions and requests from Synod, as a matter of common justice, that it direct the Presbyte-

ry of Albany to take cognizance of the slanderous assertions [the oaths] of the Rev. Messrs. Campbell and Martin, and also of Messrs. Geery and Duncan, Mrs. Wright, Dr. Buckham, and of all the other persons under their jurisdiction who are chargeable with having committed the same offence—that these persons may be called upon either to retract or to prove their assertions, [the things which they testified as witnesses under the solemnity of an oath,] that by so doing *confidence* in the Presbytery may in some measure be *restored*; and then the subscriber will hold himself ready to yield that court all due honor and obedience.” The testimony of the witnesses here named bore very hard on the ministerial and moral character of Mr. Stark and in the opinion of many entirely destroyed it; but the way he takes to evade that testimony is to charge the *witnesses* with *slandering* him, and even to demand that they be called on either to *retract* their *testimony* or to *prove* it by other witnesses! And when the witnesses are made to do this, he will honor and obey the Presbytery as in duty bound! The reader, then, will perceive in this extract a distinct admission, that Mr. Stark had *ceased to yield obedience to the Presbytery*, or what is the same thing, had declined their authority, *aye and until* a certain *impossible* condition was performed: and he very plainly declares, what is likely to prove true, that not till “THEN would he hold himself ready to yield that court all due honor and obedience.” How perfectly absurd, then, is it to represent Mr. Stark as *always denying* that he had declined the authority of the Presbytery. Are the above declarations at all consistent with an acknowledgment of submission to their authority?

We only add here, that the communication just quoted from, was by order of Synod sent down to the Presbytery—in connection with the paper of Declinature, and certain Reasons of Protest relating to another matter, that Mr. Stark might be called to account for the same. This communication is now in our hands, and on examination we find that it winds up with a pretty distinct hint to the Synod, that if they did not take good care, Mr. Stark might decline their authority also:—“The conclusion to which he [the subscriber] has come, after fully considering the matter, is neither to abandon the *profession of religion* which he has made, nor yet to *submit to acts of oppression, tyranny and injustice*, which are alike inconsistent with truth and righteousness and with the whole tenor of our religious profession. *Andrew Stark, New-York, 20 May, 1836.*”

But the Remarker next states, that “the Presbytery did not regard Mr. Stark’s letter as a declinature,” otherwise “they would have dealt with him” about it and “deprived him of a seat.” (p. 19.) This reasoning is very inconclusive, because Mr. Stark was not present at the time *to be dealt with* and to be deprived of his seat. However, the very first time that he afterwards made his appearance in Presbytery, that court did deal with him and deprive him of a seat. But let us consider this point a little more fully. At the meeting of Synod in 1836, the Presbytery was highly blamed, in the remarks of members, especially those who took an active part in Mr. Stark’s favor, because they had not suspended him for having declined their authority in the aforesaid letter. Messrs. Heron and Brown will remember this. But the Presbytery did not attempt to justify their conduct on the ground that Mr. S. had *not* declined their authority, but on the ground of “the peculiar circumstances,” in which they were placed, and also because it was thought safer to be found on the side of lenity. Though they have

since seen and acknowledged that their lenity on that and some other occasions was sinful, and for which they, as a Presbytery, have received severe chastisement in the dealings of Divine Providence. It is true, that the Presbytery, as such, did not on the reception of the paper in question, make any *formal* decision that it was a declinature; but it is not true that the members did not consider it in that light. However, it was not long afterwards, that they published, as a Presbytery, their judgment concerning it, in the following terms:—"This paper, though not in form, was yet virtually a declinature of the authority and communion of the Associate Presbytery of Albany. This consideration, together with the fact that it abounded in vituperative and slanderous assertions and insinuations, would have justified the Presbytery in suspending him *instantly*.—But knowing the prejudices they had to contend against, and being desirous of exercising as much lenity and forbearance as was consistent with duty to the Head of the Church, they were willing to wave the exercise of their own powers, to overlook his contumacy, to brook, *for the time being*, his insulting and contemptuous language, and refer the libel entirely to the adjudication of the Associate Synod." [See *Narrative*, pp. 13, 14.]

The Remarker next states, that, "even the Synod of 1836, which consisted chiefly of the libelling party, did not consider Mr. Stark's paper to be a declinature." (p. 19.) This is the very opposite of the truth. That Synod *did* consider Mr. Stark's paper to be a declinature: For on Saturday, May 28, 1836, they adopted a minute containing these words:—"To this course, [accepting the reference of the libel from the Presbytery of Albany,] Mr. Stark himself can make no reasonable objection. *Having declined the authority of the Presbytery*, there could be no other court but the Synod to try him." (See *Minutes*, p. 29.)

The Remarker thinks that Mr. Stark's admission to a seat in Synod on "Tuesday, May 31," and without any objection from the Presbytery of Albany settles the matter. But surely his admission to a seat in Synod, three days after the adoption of the above minute, could not be a reversal of the decision then made. Nor could his taking his seat without any objection from his Presbytery be considered as any evidence that he had not declined their authority; especially when it is recollected, that his taking his seat was in pursuance of a *notice* served on him *by order*, that his trial was appointed to take place that day; and also that he retained his seat only about the space of two hours; for when he found that the Synod could not be baffled by him to put off the trial till the next year, he withdrew and afterwards sent in a paper declining their authority also. (See *minutes*, pp. 25, 40.)

How much truth the above statement of the Magazine contains in another respect, when it represents the Synod of 1836 as "consisting chiefly of the libelling party," may be learned from the fact, that the "libelling party" was composed wholly and exclusively of members of the Presbytery of Albany. And from what has now been made to appear, the reader is left to say how much truth is contained in the following assertion. (p. 20.) "These statements, [respecting the declinature] are fully confirmed in every particular by the *Minutes of Synod*!!!"

We have thus examined the several reasons adduced by the Remarker to establish his position, that "Mr. Stark had not," as the Synod allege in their decision, "declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany," and they are found to be utterly groundless. We are pained, indeed, to think, that reasons, so false in fact, should lead the Remark-

er to draw such a *sweeping* conclusion, expressed in such indecorous terms as the following: "The assertion made in this preamble, [which the Synod adopted] therefore, that Mr. Stark had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany, is a *sheer fiction*, is *entirely fallacious and deceptive*." (p. 20.)

But after all, it is a matter of little consequence, whether Mr. Stark's paper be denominated a *declinature* or not. The paper speaks for itself. And the main question is, could the Presbytery admit Mr. Stark to a seat as long as that paper, call it what you please, lay on their table? To say nothing about a *declining* of the Presbytery's *authority*, was it *consistent* for them, was it *right* to admit a person to Presbyterial fellowship with them, who had charged them, in the paper referred to, with the most villainous conduct, and some of them even with *perjury*? Let the reader turn back and examine the extracts before given from the said paper, and then let him answer, whether the Presbytery did not act most justly and scripturally in refusing the writer a seat with them in their deliberations, and especially as he refused to withdraw an instrument which was so well calculated to interrupt and mar any thing like brotherly love and christian fellowship between him and his brethren?

But it is pretended that the Presbytery had nothing to do with that paper, and that it was an act of *insubordination* in them to refuse Mr. Stark a seat on the ground of it, inasmuch as the Synod of 1837 by removing his suspension left him precisely where he stood "on 31st May, 1836, before the Synod began to try the libel against him." (pp. 14 19.) It is fully admitted, and the Presbytery never thought of denying it, that the removal of the sentence of suspension did leave Mr. Stark where he was the day on which the Synod of 1836 commenced the trial of the libel against him. But where did he then stand? The Synod had on the preceding Saturday decided that he had declined the authority of the Presbytery of Albany, and had, in accordance with the reservation made by said Presbytery, transmitted to them the paper containing that declinature, together with two other papers, viz: certain Reasons of Protest, and a communication to the Synod itself, which we have before noticed. Thus the Presbytery had in their hands, "before the Synod began to try the libel against Mr. Stark," three different papers which were deemed actionable, and had also authority from the Synod "to deal with him respecting them." (*Minutes of Synod*, p. 32.) Was it not the duty of the Presbytery then, to *deal* with Mr. Stark for his paper of declinature, the very first opportunity? And how, we demand, could they be chargeable with "insubordination to Synod," in calling up that paper, when in fact they were acting in obedience to an injunction of the Synod? We do maintain, therefore, that the Remarker's charge against the Presbytery of "insubordination to Synod," is wholly devoid of truth, and can be made for no other purpose than to stigmatize the innocent with the same crime for which he himself stands branded before the community. On the whole, then, we feel perfectly safe, in leaving it to any man of common sense, who understands the matter, to say, whether the Presbytery did not act both dutifully and righteously in refusing Mr. Stark a seat on the ground of his paper of declinature; and especially as he refused to withdraw that paper?

That Mr. Stark refused to withdraw his declinature is also asserted in the preamble, which the Synod adopted, as containing the leading

grounds of its decision in the case of the Albany Presbytery; but the Remarker states, that this is not true. His words are:—"It is equally untrue that Mr. Stark refused to withdraw this fictitious declinature. In fact the Presbytery never required him to withdraw any declinature." And is it indeed *untrue* that Mr. Stark refused to withdraw his declinature? All who were present at last Synod cannot fail to remember, that it was distinctly admitted on all hands, that two members of the Presbytery (their names were mentioned, Messrs. Graham and Martin,) did ask Mr. Stark to take back the offensive paper containing his declinature, but that he refused to do it. And it will also be remembered, that this refusal was, by Rev. H. H. Blair justified on the ground that Mr. Stark had not been *Presbyterially* requested to withdraw his paper, that is, as he explained it, the Moderator, who was himself, had not formally presented the request to Mr. Stark. But all who know any thing about deliberative bodies, know that questions put by members to one another, are supposed to be put through the presiding officer. If the presiding officer does not arrest such questions, it is taken for granted that they have his sanction. Our own impression however is, that the Moderator, on the occasion spoken of, did reiterate the request, started first by Mr. Graham and afterwards renewed by Mr. Martin. But it is immaterial whether he did or not. It is sufficient that he and the other members all acquiesced in it. And even on the supposition that they did not, the fact that one or two of the brethren desired the withdrawal of the offensive paper, rendered it obligatory on Mr. Stark, if he were come claiming a seat in good faith and with the christian desire of cultivating peace and harmony in the Presqtery, to take back the obnoxious document, which, on account of its "cruel, unjust and slanderous statements," must continue to irritate the feelings and turn from him the countenance of his brethren. Accordingly, his refusal to withdraw the paper in question, even in this view of the case, not only justified the Presbytery in refusing him a seat, but is also sufficient to justify the Synod in the assertion made in their preamble. Now all this was well known to the Remarker and yet he deliberately tells us that the Synod has voted what was *untrue*, when it voted that Mr. Stark *refused* to withdraw his declinature. In bringing such a charge against the Synod, the Remarker has, we think most wantonly violated the truth. For it is a mere quibble and worse than a quibble to say, that "the *Presbytery* never required Mr. S. to withdraw any declinature."

But what is more suprising still, is the representation that the declinature was not assigned as a reason for Mr. Stark's exclusion from a seat in Presbytery and was not even thought of at that time. The Magazine says:—"For this course of proceeding the Presbytery did not assign any reason. But they have since asserted *untruly*, that they excluded Mr. Stark because he had declined the authority of the Presbytery and still refused to withdraw his declension." (p. 14.) Again, "The Presbytery, as will be seen by their own minutes inserted above, merely decided that Mr. Stark had no right to a seat, in direct opposition to a decision of Synod declaring that he had a right to a seat. When they found it might be difficult to justify their conduct, it would seem that somebody helped them out of their embarrassment, by contriving the story of the declinature." (p. 20.) It is not usual for church courts to embody in their minutes, the reasons of their votes. It is a rare thing indeed, if ever done, for them to record their reasons for *rejecting* a motion. But as the rejection of the motion, by Dr. P. Bullions, to "put

Mr. Stark's name on the roll," was *protested against*, the Presbytery recorded and sent up the reasons of their vote to Synod in their Presbyterial Report, where this affair of the declinature will be seen to be mentioned as one.

But the editor of the Magazine *knows*, that the "declinature" was mentioned on the floor of Presbytery as a reason for Mr. Stark's exclusion; he knows that it occasioned a long debate; he knows that we read certain portions of Mr. Stark's paper and commented on them, in order to show, in opposition to the position he took, that it *was* a declinature; he knows that Mr. Smart took the ground, that to admit Mr. Stark, with that paper lying between him and the Presbytery, would be to destroy presbyterial parity, and that for his part he would sit with no man there except he came as an equal; and he also knows that when he stated that Presbytery could only call Mr. Stark to account, according to their own reserve, for "the offensive matter" contained in that paper, Mr. Smart replied that Mr. Stark's *declining the authority of the Presbytery*, in that paper, was "offensive matter," and for that the Presbytery had the right, in virtue of their own reserve as sanctioned by Synod, to call him to account. Does the Doctor then publish the truth, when he says that "the story of the declinature was contrived by somebody afterwards, to help the Presbytery out of their embarrassment?" But if any doubt yet remains as to the Doctor's *veracity* in this matter, it will be completely removed by the following extract from his Reasons of Protest, which were written within ten days after the meeting of that Presbytery: "The ground," says he, "taken by some members of Presbytery, who voted with the majority, viz: that *Mr. Stark formerly declined the authority of Presbytery*, is wholly untenable in support of this decision." What will the reader now think of the "story of the declinature's being *contrived* by somebody afterwards, to help the Presbytery out of their embarrassment?" But besides all this, the editor, as if conscience-struck for doing such open violence to the truth, faintly concedes in a foot-note, that *something* was said by *somebody*, on that occasion, respecting the declinature; but in making this concession, which directly contradicts what is stated in the text, he commits as great an offence against the truth as any thing we have noticed. His words are: "A member of Presbytery, indeed, on that occasion, remarked, that if Mr. Stark would withdraw his declinature and submit to any thing the Presbytery might do, without appealing to Synod, he would be for admitting him to a seat." (p. 20, note.) A statement so absurd and barefacedly untrue needs no refutation.

The Remarker's conclusion in relation to the Synod's decision respecting the declinature is drawn in these characteristic terms: "This decision of Synod, then, so far as it relates to Mr. Stark, rests wholly on misrepresentation and falsehood." (p. 20.) But from what has now been made to appear, we leave it to the reader to say, whether this conclusion does not *rest* where its author, by a usual mistake, has put to rest the Synod's decision?

Respecting another item in the Synod's decision, the Remarker *gravely* says: "The late Synod, it seems, has given as its opinion, that if a Presbytery once make an unlawful decision, it has no right to review or reverse it." (p. 21.) The Doctor's warrant for making this strange inference, is simply the statement made in the preamble adopted by the Synod, that the "*protesters* had no right to review or reverse the deed of Presbytery," against which they had protested. And who *ever*,

save Messrs Blair, Stark and Bullions, supposed they had! If protesters can club together in the absence of the members against whose presbyterial deed they had protested, and reverse, *ad libitum*, the said deed, there is an end put at once to the presbyterian subordination of church courts. Indeed, if *protesters* can review and reverse presbyterial deeds, then, *minorities* must govern, and the practice of prosecuting appeals before a higher court must be a "useless ceremony." But how any person of sane mind could wring from this decision of Synod, the inference, that that court "had given as its opinion, that if a *Presbytery* once make an unlawful decision, it has no right to review or reverse it," is a question which necessarily involves a very unpleasant thought. Doubtless there is some moral perversity at work at the bottom of all this studied system of misrepresentation and calumny.

But to proceed. On pages 21 and 22 there is a *note*, in small letter, covering nearly a page and a half of the Magazine, the object of which is to render the Synod as ridiculous and contemptible as possible, by a bold stroke at caricature and lampoonry. But the whole tirade is built on two most glaring perversions of facts. The Synod is represented as being in a great "dilemma." "It must be decided, on the one hand, that the admission of Mr. Stark vitiated the constitution and proceedings of the Presbytery of Albany, and yet, the illegal exclusion of three members must not vitiate the Presbytery of Cambridge." This was the puzzle! And how was the Synod to surmount the difficulty? One proposed one thing and another another; but the difficulty still remained; till at length Mr. Martin stepped forth with his "sugar and arsenic argument," and lo! "what a mountain was removed by the very statement of this clear and convincing argument—the whole difficulty vanished in a moment," &c. &c. Now the whole *sport* of this representation is spoiled by the simple fact that the "sugar and arsenic argument" was not introduced till *four days* after the time the Synod is represented to have been in this wonderful dilemma! Mr. M. as a party concerned was not allowed to take any part in the Synod's discussion of the affair of the Albany Presbytery, which affair was brought to a close on *Saturday*, and it was not till the *Wednesday* following, on the trial of Dr. A. Bullions' case, that the "argument," or rather illustration, referred to, was employed. But the other falsehood on which this *funny* picture rests, is the allegation that "three members of Cambridge Presbytery had been *illegally* excluded from seats in that court." At the time fixed for the "dilemma" it was not known in Synod, that three members had been excluded from seats in the Presbytery of Cambridge. The papers referring to that Presbytery's matters had not then been read. Consequently there was no room for the "dilemma" spoken of. Besides it is not true that those "three members were illegally excluded," and yet this was also necessary in order to the existence of the "dilemma." But the Synod has not yet decided that their exclusion was *illegal*, and never can, without either altering or acting in violation of our Books of Discipline. But we have dwelt perhaps too long on this silly caricature. And yet it may be useful, as it will show to all who have a just perception of moral principles, that the person who can utter the most palpable untruths, for the sake of making a *laugh* at the expense of the reputation of a church court, would not be very likely to hesitate about uttering an untruth for his own supposed benefit, or for the real injury of those whom he denounces as his "persecutors." It will help also to show how much weight can be attached to

any of the statements contained in the Magazine which we are reviewing.

The second preamble in the decision of Synod, as given on a preceding page, is also converted by the Remarker into a theme on which to display the capacities of his mind for wit, misrepresentation and caricature. The Synod say: "Whereas Dr. P. Bullions was under process for scandal, he had no right to accuse, and therefore the decision excluding from seats in the Associate Presbytery of Albany, Messrs. Martin and Campbell, is null and void." The Remarker, after exhausting his wit on this resolution, says: "It was incumbent on the Synod to prove, that Dr. P. Bullions had actually brought some accusation against one or all of those members who retired from the Presbytery, and in consequence of which they were excluded from their seats. This is *most distinctly and unequivocally denied.*" (p. 23.) The Synod had before them the evidence that Dr. Bullions was under process for scandal. There was also before them the Doctor's resolution for the exclusion of Messrs. Campbell, Martin, and their elders, from seats in Presbytery, in which he accused them of "insubordination to Synod," in not having voted in favor of his *motion* to have 'Mr. Stark's name put on the roll.' It appeared before Synod, that just as those individuals, who affected to be acting as the Presbytery of Albany, were about to vote the said resolution for the exclusion of the brethren named, those brethren denied their authority and withdrew. And it also appeared to Synod, from the pretended Presbytery's own journals of its own proceedings, that when the Dr. thought he had found a better ground of accusation against his brethren, he withdrew his resolution in which he only accused them of "insubordination to Synod," and had another substituted in its place, in which they were accused of the high crime of insubordination to him and his fellows, in having denied their authority as a lawful Presbytery. Although, indeed, it was not *expressed* in the minute which was read, that Dr. Bullions framed the *substitute*, yet there is reason to believe it was his production; as Mr. Stark would hardly be so *impolite* as to take the business out of his hands, which he had so auspiciously begun. But whether he prepared this second resolution, or not, is immaterial; since his withdrawal of the former to give place to it was equivalent to his adoption of it, according to a rule of parliamentary procedure. Hence the exclusion of Messrs. Campbell and Martin was properly declared to be "null and void," inasmuch as it was effected, so far as the Synod could judge, in "consequence" of a person under process for scandal being allowed to stand up as the accuser of his brethren. Indeed, all who have any correct knowledge of this affair, know, that had it not been for Dr. P. Bullions, the Presbytery of Albany would not have been brought, at that time, into such a disgraceful position;—that had it not been for him, the *protesters*, and therefore the *minority*, would never have thought of assuming the name and powers of the *majority*.

Again, the Synod's decision is thought to be "illegal," by the Remarker, because certain brethren were prevented from saying all they wished to say, by a call for the "previous question." "This," says he, "is supposed to be the first time, that this expedient was ever resorted to in judicial proceedings, and a decision made as a party measure, which ought therefore to be disregarded, as entirely illegal." (p. 24.) The truth is, this matter had been under consideration between two and three days, to the entire exclusion of all other business; members had

become wearied in listening to long speeches, which seemed to answer no other purpose than to kill time; all the members had had an opportunity of expressing their minds on the case, as the roll was called through from beginning to end; many considered that time had already been sinfully wasted, that no new light was to be expected, that there was a disposition manifested in a certain quarter, to speak against time, and that there was much urgent business remaining to be transacted; hence, when the "previous question" was called for, the Synod sustained the call. But to say, that this was "the first time that this expedient was ever resorted to in judicial proceedings," is saying what almost every body, who has any knowledge of such proceedings, knows to be untrue. And the Remarker well knew, at the very time he was bringing this complaint against the Synod, that at its previous meeting in Pittsburgh, his own party resorted more than once to the same expedient, and that too in "proceedings" equally "judicial"! Persons, however, must be hard pressed for reasons, when they are forced to bring up this for one to prove the illegality of the Synod's decision, and to justify their own rebellion.

And equally futile and groundless is the other reason mentioned on page 25, viz: That there was a number voted in the case, who were "more or less concerned in Mr. Webster's pamphlet, who were evidently parties, and could have no right to vote in making this decision." And what had Mr. Webster's pamphlet to do with the matter then before the Synod? This pamphlet seems to be haunting the imaginations of some people to this late hour. What a wonderful pamphlet that must be, the production of which called forth into exercise and gave employment to such a large proportion of the heads and hands appertaining to the Associate Synod! For besides the members of the Albany Presbytery, who were excluded from voting in the case, "there were a number of others concerned in it." Surely there must be some truth, one is almost tempted to think, in a thing which was the "conjunct" production of so many ministers and professors of Theology, and which ceases not to be continually dancing before the vision of the "persecuted party"! We find the Magazine, after it has reached the respectable age of No. 5, still thrown into *spasms* and foaming at the mouth on account of that terrible and convulsing pamphlet! But supposing there was a number concerned in Mr. Webster's pamphlet, which we have before shown to be a wanton calumny, how could this disqualify them for voting in the case of the Albany Presbytery, a case wholly disconnected with Mr. Webster and his pamphlet too? Not being deeply versed in *poetic lore* and therefore having no *stanza* at command to grace in a proper manner this profound argument, with the Dr.'s permission, we will use the one which he himself has furnished us: (p. 23.)

"As Solon said to one in judgment weak,

I thought thee wise until I heard thee speak."

Is it any wonder, then, after advancing such *true and weighty* reasons to convict the Synod's decision of illegality, the Dr. should trumpet forth his conclusion in the following *chaste and classic* style? "From all these reasons, it must be **ABUNDANTLY** manifest, that this decision of Synod is an outrage on all decency, a violation of the most sacred principles of justice, and a most daring attempt to impose upon the credulity of the public." (p. 25.) But the Remarker had come to the same *charitable* conclusion before, but expressed, in somewhat different words:

"It is, indeed, but too manifest, that these two resolutions of the Rev. Synod, finding the decision in question 'null and void,' and Messrs. Martin, Campbell, and Milmine to be 'truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany,' are mere gratuitous assertions, which can impose only upon the ignorant." (p. 23.) We have quoted this last sentence merely to let our readers have another specimen of the Remarker's facility in perverting the truth. The Synod never decided that "Messrs. Martin, Campbell and Milmine, were truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany." And yet this is repeated in the Magazine time after time in order to answer a purpose. Let the reader turn back to the Synod's decision and he will find, it is the "*body*" of which Messrs. Martin and Campbell are "members," that is declared to be "the Associate Presbytery of Albany." Nothing is said about Mr. Milmine. The Remarker's object, in this gross perversion, is to create the belief that it was a *minority* of the members of the Albany Presbytery that Synod declared to be the true Presbytery. But this was not the case. For at the time the decision was made the following ministers belonged to the "*body*" spoken of: Messrs. Laing, Campbell, Martin, Graham and Defreest; while connected with the other party there were only Messrs. Stark, Bullions and Blair; and the first of these being under a sentence of exclusion, had no right to act as a presbyter, and the second being under process for scandal had surely no right to accuse his judges, with the view to their expulsion from the court. Besides it may be proper to state, that the Remarker has carefully concealed the fact, though knowing it, that Mr. Robert Martin, elder from Albany, was present and co-operated with Messrs. Campbell, Martin and Milmine, in constituting the true Presbytery of Albany after the division so often alluded to took place. Hence the Remarker had as good reason for mentioning *his* name as that of Mr. Milmine in the sentence above quoted, but this would have been approximating too nearly to the truth to have answered the purpose intended.

After what has been made to appear, it will be unnecessary for us to enter on any more particular defence of the Synod's decision respecting the case of the Albany Presbytery. We have examined all the reasons the Remarker has adduced in opposition to the correctness of that decision, and have found them to be entirely false and groundless. It may, therefore, be fairly inferred, that the decision in question is in accordance with truth and righteousness. But if the reader be desirous of more light on the subject, we refer him to the plain and conclusive argument written by A *TRANSYLVANIAN*, and published in the January number of the Monitor, in justification of the Synod's decision in this case.

This decision of the Synod was followed by another, suspending the members composing the pretended Presbytery from the exercise of their office and from the communion of the church, which deed of suspension was chiefly founded on their declinature of the Synod's authority. Respecting this latter decision the Remarker says very little, but seems to think it hard, that the Synod should inflict this censure after the subjects of it had withdrawn, forgetting how he and his associates had treated Messrs. Campbell and Martin for only a *supposed* offence of a similar nature; which, to use his own words, "could have no other effect than to show the spirit and temper of the [pretended] court, and to expose it to derision." The Synod's decision of which we are now speaking is contained in the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas, the conduct of Messrs. H. H. Blair, P. Bullions, D. D. and A. Stark, ministers, condemned in the resolution passed by Synod on Saturday, is not only irregular, but sinful and distracting to the church: And whereas, the paper of the said ministers, together with Messrs. John Edwards, Robert Crookshanks and John A. Gilmore, which purports to be some of their reasons of protest, and also their declinature given in this afternoon, offer a contemptuous opposition to the authority of this Synod: Therefore, *Resolved*, That said ministers and elders be suspended from the exercise of their offices and the communion of the church, and that they be referred to the Presbytery of Albany for the ultimate issuing of their case, either by returning to submission to the authority of the church, or by the infliction of her higher censures."

This sentence is said by the Remarker to have been "prepared by Rev. J. P. Miller." (p. 27.) But this is only a part of the truth, the other part would not bear telling so well. The motion for censuring these brethren was introduced by another person. While it was under discussion, Dr. Bruce suggested that it would not do to suspend them and there leave them, but that they should be referred back to the Presbytery of Albany for further dealing. Whereupon he and Mr. Miller were appointed a committee to draw up a resolution containing this suggestion. And we are authorized to state that Mr. Miller, as scribe, framed the preamble and resolution according to the dictation of the chairman, Dr. B., even to the "concluding sentence," of which the Remarker complains as being "more doubtful than any thing he ever remembers to have seen." (p. 28.) But it may be proper to add, that there can be no *doubt* about the meaning of that "concluding sentence," with any who are acquainted with matters of church discipline; nor is there any "doubt" about it in the mind of the Remarker himself.

The Remarker attempts to impress the public with the belief that two of the elders, whose names are mentioned in the above preamble, were unjustly censured, as they had no knowledge of "the offence laid to their charge, having left Philadelphia nearly two days before the paper was drawn up for which they had been excommunicated." (p. 28.) Now, the "protestation" given in on Saturday was subscribed by all these ministers and elders; on Monday morning the "Reasons of Protest" were handed in, signed by "H. H. Blair, Moderator, and Andrew Stark, Presbytery Clerk," and in the afternoon the "Declinature," signed after the same manner. Inasmuch, therefore, as the "protestation" was signed by the elders in question, the Synod had no reason to believe, that the subsequent papers signed only by the *official gentlemen*, had not been signed in good faith in behalf of the whole fraternity. If those *officials* had no authority for signing in behalf of their brethren, they should have told the Synod so. This surely was the course honesty would dictate. If the two elders referred to, therefore, have sustained any injury at the hand of Synod, they must blame those who pretended to act in their name in their absence, and also themselves for having been caught in bad company. But subsequent events have shown, that the two elders have not considered themselves unjustly dealt with by the *sentence* in which they were involved: For if they had, the evil could speedily have been remedied by their application to the Presbytery to which Synod referred them for further dealing. Let every candid mind, therefore, judge whether the Remarker's language in relation to this particular, be not something more than *hyperbolic*,

when he says :—"The whole matter would be only ridiculous, were it not for the impiety and inconsistency of men professing to act in the name of the Prince of peace, while they thus recklessly thunder out their anathemas, like 'a madman who casteth firebrands, arrows and death.'"^{*} (p. 28.)

We have now reviewed all the misstatements and perversions of facts, which we consider worthy of special notice, as contained in the first number of the Magazine; not that we have by any means exhausted the subject, as perhaps we have not animadverted on a *tithe* of the objectionable matter that presented itself; but our expose of the more fundamental and mischievous falsehoods, will, we hope, render all the rest comparatively harmless. It was our intention when we began, to proceed regularly through each succeeding number of the Magazine, and in like manner detect and expose its misstatements, but this we find would be almost an endless task, and therefore we will forbear. And, indeed, it is not very necessary to notice the assertions of the Remarker in those numbers in which he misrepresents the proceedings had in the cases of Dr. A. Bullions and Mr. Stalker, for the Documentary History lately published by a committee of the Presbytery of Cambridge, is every way sufficient to guard the cause of truth, order and righteousness on those points. Besides, it is a very disagreeable task, at least to us, to be thus exposing the obliquity of a man who claims to be regarded as a minister of the gospel. We have, also, frequently thought, since we began this review, of the advice, which a venerable elder of our church at the west gave us in relation to this Magazine, viz: *not to dirty our fingers with the dirty thing*; which advice we should most certainly have followed, feeling its force, had not a combination of circumstances imperiously demanded this disagreeable service at our hands.

As a *finish*, then, to that part of our work which consists in pointing out and refuting false statements and misrepresentations, we will notice, in order to show that the Remarker has not yet overcome his dread of Mr. Webster's pamphlet, nor his propensity to misrepresent facts, the following statement which occurs in a *note* to page 138, No. 5.†— "Mr. Webster was charged with having slandered Mr. Stark, by publishing him to the world as having 'left his congregation in Shields without leave or license.'" Then follows an extract from the minutes of the Presbytery to which Mr. Stark belonged, setting forth that his pastoral relation to his congregation had been dissolved; to which the

* The Remarker quotes but a part of the proverb; the whole of it runs thus:—"As a madman, who casteth firebrands, arrows and death; so is the man that deceiveth his neighbor, and saith, Am not I in sport." (Prov. xxvi. 18, 19.) According to Matthew Henry, this Proverb admits of a far more appropriate application than that which the Remarker makes of it. Saith that Commentator:—"See here, How mischievous those are that make 'no conscience of deceiving their neighbors, they are as madmen that cast firebrands, arrows and death, so much hurt they do by their deceipts; they value themselves upon it as politic cunning men, but really they are as madmen. There is not a greater madness in the world than a wilful sin. 'Tis not only the *passionate furious* man, but the *malicious deceitful* man, that is a *madman*: he doth in effect cast *firebrands, arrows and death*, he doth more mischief than he can imagine. Fraud and falsehood burn like firebrands, kill, even at a distance, like *arrows*.—By lying and slandering in jest, men learn themselves and teach others to lie and slander in earnest; and a false report raised in *mirth*, may spread in *malice*; and if a man may tell a lie to make himself *merry*, why not to make himself *rich*, and so *truth quite perisheth*, and men *teach their tongues to tell lies*. (Jer. ix. 5.) If men would consider that a lie comes from the Devil and brings to hell-fire, sure that would spoil the *sport* of it; 'tis casting *arrows and death* to themselves."

† This No. 5. for *December*, perhaps, excels all its predecessors in its unbridled slander, and its reckless, determined, persevering and malicious perversion of facts. In this work of Satan, the editor has received a new *ally*, who shows himself to be well skilled in his vocation. But we have reasons for not at present exposing his name to the public.

Remarker adds—"Mr. W., by the testimony of Mr. Campbell, proved to the satisfaction of Presbytery, that Mr. Stark, who was loosed by a unanimous vote of Presbytery from the congregation of South Shields, left that congregation 'without leave or license.'" Now, in precisely the same way the Dr. might prove that he did not leave the congregation of South Argyle "without leave or license," for he can show from the minutes of the Presbytery of Cambridge, that his pastoral relation to that congregation has also been dissolved. But when? Some months after he left his congregation! From the papers laid before our Presbytery on the trial of Mr. W., it appeared, according to our best recollection, that as much as a whole year elapsed between the time of Mr. Stark's leaving his congregation and the dissolution of the pastoral relation. His Presbytery refused to dissolve that relation; the matter went before the General Associate Synod; that court ordered the Presbytery to proceed to dissolve the relation; the Presbytery then cited Mr. Stark to appear at their bar and answer to some charge they had against him before they could carry the Synod's order into execution; but Mr. Stark, as his manner is, refused to obey the citation and immediately embarked for this country; and *then* it seems the Presbytery was obliged to dissolve that pastoral relation! These are the facts in the case, as they were presented on Mr. W.'s trial, as nearly as we can remember. If we have not stated them accurately, our brethren who were present can inform us, and we shall be ready to make the necessary correction. And yet in the face of these facts the Remarker would have his readers believe that Mr. W., in the above instance, slandered Mr. S., and that the Presbytery of Albany not only "allowed him to justify his sin," but was very easily "satisfied in respect of testimony" offered in his defence.

Now let the reader remember, that all the foregoing deviations from truth, honesty and justice, which we have noticed, are to be found in a professed religious periodical, bearing on its title-page this heavenly motto:—*Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just.*

—

We will now proceed to notice a few of the many *inconsistencies*, (we designedly use a *soft* term) which contribute to give character to this "Associate Presbyterian Magazine."

And, indeed, the very name of the Magazine involves an inconsistency and deception. The editor and those immediately associated with him in originating and conducting this work, had declined the authority of the Associate Presbyterian Church, as exercised by her highest judicatory, and had, for their contumacy and other sinful conduct, been cast out of her communion, and yet they have denominated their periodical "*The Associate Presbyterian Magazine*," as if it were the advocate and organ of the Associate Presbyterian Church; when, in fact, it is only the mouth-piece of a small disaffected, disorganizing and schismatical faction. The name is, therefore, inconsistent, and appears to have been assumed, not for the purpose of defending, but of aspersing and lampooning the Associate Church, through her ministers and judicatories, and of imposing upon and misleading the ignorant and unwary.

It is also inconsistent for the originators of this Magazine to call themselves "the Associate Presbytery of Albany." There is a Presbytery of Albany in subordination to the General Assembly: there is an Associate Presbytery of Albany in subordination to the Associate

Synod : and the suspended brethren, it seems, also call themselves the "Associate Presbytery of Albany." But to whom are they subordinate ? The Associate Synod, who has the power of erecting and dissolving Presbyteries, has refused to recognize them as a Presbytery—has expressly declared, that they were not "the Associate Presbytery of Albany." Now people may call themselves what they please ; but certainly it is very inconsistent, nay, *childish*, for our suspended brethren to affect the name of the Synod's Presbytery of Albany, after all the hard things they say of both those courts. Do they intend it as a *mark of respect* to the Synod's Presbytery, that they call themselves after its name ; or do they intend by this to practice a deception on the religious community ?

From what has been made to appear in the preceding part of this review, it will be seen, how grossly inconsistent it is, if not profane, to use as a motto to the contents of such a Magazine, the text, *Whatever things are true ; whatsoever things are honest ; whatsoever things are just.* Did the editor intend to use this motto merely for the purpose of forming a striking *contrast* between the *outside* and the *inside* of his Magazine, he was happy in his choice. But if he intended by these "good words," (Rom. xvi. 18.) to deceive his readers as to the true character of the contents of his Magazine, *the Lord will not hold him guiltless.*

The Magazine very gravely charges upon the judicatories of the Associate Church, "the corrupt exercise of discipline." (p. 2.) Again, it says :—"A considerable party in the Associate Synod have adopted the most arbitrary and despotic principles in church policy." (p. 3.) These charges are made by men, who, professing to act as a judicatory, did, on the 18th April, 1838, undertake to *exercise discipline* on Messrs. Campbell and Martin, because they had at a former meeting been guilty of *voting* against a motion presented by Dr. P. Bullions in favor of admitting Mr. Stark to a seat in Presbytery ! We leave the reader to muse on this *inconsistency* of the "persecuted" brethren.

In the midst of a highly inflammatory piece of declamation, the obvious design and tendency of which is to form a *party* in the church, to *alienate* brethren from one another, to *hurt* and *destroy* God's heritage, the editor breaks forth in the language of fervent prayer :—"O for the time, when there shall be 'nothing to hurt or to destroy in God's holy mountain.'" (p. 9.) Strange that he did not himself perceive and feel shocked at the glaring inconsistency of uttering such a prayer, while he was laboring with all his might to increase and perpetuate the very evils which he asks God to terminate !

The Remarker says, page 27—"As the Presbytery [meaning the suspended brethren] expressly declined the authority and further action of the Associate Synod, many might be disposed to think that the Synod would have desisted from all further attempts to injure them ; [i. e. by church censure.] But those who may think so, are but little acquainted with the spirit of the prevailing party in that Synod." And in a few lines afterwards follows the story of the Great Reformer and the "Pope's bull of ejection." Now for the inconsistency. It was but a little more than a month before the time that the Synod thus showed its "spirit and temper, and exposed itself to derision," as the Remarker has it, that he and his coadjutors committed *nearly* the same "outrage" on Messrs. Campbell and Martin. For no sooner had these brethren declined their assumed authority and retired, than they manifested their

"spirit and temper" by "levelling their censures" at them. But as they had withdrawn, in imitation of the Great Reformer, "their suspension become a blow in the air—an exercise of authority without an object."—To convince our readers that we are not imposing on their credulity in this matter, we will here insert a Notice which we received, dated "New-York, 1 May, 1838," and signed "Andrew Stark, P. Clerk :"—"It is further my duty hereby to give you notice, that in consequence of your having declined the authority of the Associate Presbytery of Albany, at their meeting on the 18th ult., that court found it to be their duty to suspend you from your seat in Presbytery, till such time as you give satisfaction for this offence."—Mr. Campbell also received a similar notice. It is not our intention to make any remarks on this procedure of Messrs. Stark, Bullions and Blair. Their deed betrays a consciousness of a want of just Presbyterian authority, or they would have inflicted a very different censure from a *suspension from a seat*, where no seat was asked, and where it was denied that any *Presbyterial* seat was to be had. We only, however, notice this procedure of theirs to show the flagrant inconsistency of which they are guilty, when condemning the Synod in the harshest terms for doing to them as they had just been doing to others! *Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal?*

Messrs. Campbell, Martin and Milmine are blamed for not appealing to Synod and waiting the judgment of that court, instead of withdrawing from their brethren. (p. 21.) Now Dr. Bullions knows that they did offer to protest and appeal, but that he and his associates treated the offer with contempt, and would allow no notice to be taken of it whatever! Besides, he and his two brethren had themselves appealed to Synod in relation to the same matter, why did not they wait the judgment of that court, instead of deciding on the merits their own appeal? They had already waited ten months from the date of their appeal; could they not have waited one month longer?

The Remarker attempts to justify the conduct of Dr. A. Bullions in declining the authority of the Presbytery of Cambridge on two grounds; *First*, because the Presbytery declined "was only a fragment of that Presbytery." "The fragment," says he, "that remained, and which had unlawfully usurped all the authority, could not justly claim to be the Presbytery. The Dr. was, therefore, fully justified in declining their authority and action in his case, because they were not the Presbytery, but a fragment of the Presbytery only—not quite the one half of the Presbytery of Cambridge." (p. 49.) Now, by some strange mistake, the Remarker here gives a true description of the state of *his own* Presbytery at the time Messrs. Campbell and Martin declined their authority: "They were not the Presbytery, but a fragment of the Presbytery only—not quite the one half of the Presbytery." And nearly a moiety of that fragment had, before that time, been justly excluded from a seat; but notwithstanding this, fragment that it was, it unlawfully "usurped all the authority" of the Presbytery of Albany. The other ground on which the Remarker would justify "the Doctor," is, because "this *Presbytery* had broken down and trampled under foot all the principles and rules of Presbyterian church discipline. "Protest and appeal," continues the Remarker, "is the constitutional remedy provided in the Presbyterian Church, for obtaining redress of grievances. The Doctor had recourse to this remedy against a decision that he believed to be unjust, but this Presbytery had disal-

owed the privilege. It then became his incumbent duty to decline their authority." (p. 49.) This indeed is not true, as far as the Presbytery of Cambridge is concerned, but exactly true according to another application. For the man who thus writes was himself a "principal actor in those scenes," which were enacted at Albany on the 18th April, 1838, when Messrs. Campbell and Martin were "disallowed the privilege of protest and appeal," and were suspended from their seats in Presbytery, for doing what the Remarker calls an "incumbent duty" in such a case, viz. "declining their authority!" *The legs of the lame are not equal!*

The Remarker asserts that the Presbytery of Cambridge "set aside the right of protest and appeal; and in this way did all in its power to destroy Presbyterianism; for certainly," says he, "if the right of protest and appeal be once taken away, there will remain little else in Presbyterianism worth preserving." He further adds: "It is rather surprising that any body should be found so dull as to imagine that persons who could act as this Presbytery has done in this case, can have the least respect for Presbyterian church government." (pp. 42, 43.) The reader need scarcely be informed that this charge as brought against the Presbytery of Cambridge, is utterly destitute of truth. To use the Remarker's own language, "it is a sheer fiction." But our object in making this quotation, is to show the strange inconsistency of the Remarker, who, with his associates, while pretending to act as a Presbytery, did the very thing which he here falsely charges upon the Presbytery of Cambridge. For that pretended Presbytery did, in the exercise of its usurped authority, actually take away from Messrs. Campbell and Martin the right of protest and appeal, and "in this way did all in their power to destroy Presbyterianism." Surely, according to their own doctrine, to which we heartily subscribe, the Synod acted most righteously in declaring them no *Presbyterian court*, and "their acts to be null and void." They showed by setting aside "the right of protest and appeal," that "they could not have the least respect for Presbyterian church government;" and this, indeed, was one of the strongest reasons that influenced Messrs. Martin and Campbell to decline their authority and withdraw from them. The Remarker, therefore, gives us another instance of a man, *condemned out of his own mouth*.

How inconsistent in the Remarker is it, to charge others with acting *unjustly and dishonorably*, when he himself, after making a charge against a brother, and having its injustice proven to him, still continues to repeat it without the least syllable of explanation! Thus he charged Mr. Miller with having stated in a conversation with Dr. Savage of Argyle, "that the case of Mr. Stalker would end in suspension, and that this, with other circumstances, would end in a division of the Synod." (p. 36.) After making, or rather repeating this charge from Mr. Stalker, the Remarker was shown Dr. Savage's statement respecting the conversation alluded to, as follows:—" (Dr. Savage asks the questions, and Mr. Miller answers.) Q. 'Do you think the Presbytery now in session will silence the Rev. D. Stalker from preaching the gospel?' A. 'I think they will not.' And here Mr. Miller spoke favorably of Mr. Stalker, and said the Presbytery would have no difficulty with him, if he were left to his own judgment without advice. Q. 'What do you suppose will be the final termination of the difficulties now existing in the Associate Church?' A. 'I do not know. The probability is, that the Rev. A. Bullions, P. Bullions, A. Stark, D. Stalker and other dis-

affected persons may secede and become a separate body, or join some other denomination."—And yet the Remarker still continues to repeat this calumny against Mr. Miller, without the least allusion to Dr. Savage's testimony! He says in the Dec. No.—"Mr. Stalker objected to Mr. Miller because he had already, in some degree, prejudged the case, as appeared from his having stated that it was likely to issue in Mr. Stalker's suspension, and that it would end in a division of the Synod." (p. 144.) *Whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just.*

The Remarker is quite *positive*, that, "the simple fact of the members of the Presbytery of Cambridge publishing this pamphlet [The Documentary History] in their own vindication, proves beyond all controversy, that they have no confidence in the integrity of their own conduct; that they fear that the unbiassed voice of the public must be against them; and hence, this effort to bespeak the favor of the community by issuing this publication." (p. 105.) *Quere?* Was this the secret, impulsive cause that brought into existence the *Associate Presbyterian Magazine*, through the medium of which, the "persecuted" brethren promised the public "a full and impartial account of all the proceedings of the church courts against them;" feeling themselves "imperatively called to such an undertaking, by a high sense of duty to themselves and to their adhering congregations?" (p. 1.) If not, how inconsistent is it in the Remarker to charge upon others a consciousness and design which, he must know, can, with equal propriety, be charged upon himself? Is not this to be guilty of *judging them that do such things and yet doing the same thyself?* (Rom. ii. 3.)

The Editor is pleased to publish to the world that "the Presbytery of Albany refused to give Mr. Stark the extracts," ordered by Synod, when he knows that the Presbytery voted to give the extracts in question, but was arrested from doing it by a protest and appeal; the reasons of which protest, he knows, were placed in his own hand to be answered; but not being able to answer them satisfactorily, the matter was buried in his own self-constituted and irresponsible Presbytery, so that the protester heard nothing more of his Reasons, and the Synod was saved the trouble of considering the appeal. The minutes of the Presbytery of Albany, after stating that "Mr. Stark's request [for the extracts] was granted;" adds, "Against the decision, Mr. Martin claimed the privilege of protesting and appealing to Synod, for reasons to be given in. This protest was admitted—and Messrs. Bullions and Brinkerhoff were appointed a committee to answer the Reasons." But notwithstanding Dr. Bullions failed to answer these Reasons, yet he tries to bespatter the Presbytery for not giving Mr. Stark the "extracts," when their hands were tied by *his* delinquency! Is this inconsistency, or is it worse?

When we think of the editor's motto, how inconsistent, also, does it appear for him to publish to the world a long article full of "raw and undigested scandal," from the pen of one who has rendered himself somewhat notorious in Synod on account of his recklessness, exaggeration and bluster, with merely this general expression of condemnation, that he "can not entirely concur in every sentiment expressed in it?" (p. 149.) Justice to his readers, one would think, should have led him to specify at least, *some* of the *sentiments* (he means *facts*) from which he expresses his dissent. Or does he wish to save his own credit by this general impeachment of the accuracy of the article, and at the

same time have his readers believe the whole of the trash contained in it?

The Messrs. Gordons are charged with something like *ingratitude* for opposing Dr. A. Bullions, when *he was to be blamed*, whom his cousin of the Magazine calls their "benefactor." (p. 159.) But did he think of the inconsistency of making such a charge, when, he was, at the very time, abusing and slandering his own benefactor, the Associate Synod? If Dr. A. B. showed any kindness to the Messrs. Gordons more than almost any modest christian would do without ever speaking of it, we do not know it; but certain it is that the Associate Synod gave Dr. P. Bullions, and Mr. Stark also, *one hundred dollars* each, towards defraying their expenses in coming to this country. This was right in itself. It was proper for the Synod to give this sum, and every way honorable in them to receive it. We have received favors in a similar way ourselves. But how ungrateful is it to treat their "friend and benefactor" as they have done? Before they entered on this crusade against the Synod, they should have paid back that money.* After Mr. Stark became wealthy, some who did not know him, thought surely, that (laying a portion of a certain legacy out of the question) he would at least pay back to Synod the *hundred dollars*! But such became convinced of their mistake, when they found him taxing the Synod with *nine dollars and fifty cents*, for the importation of a few copies of the Testimony of Original Seceders, for the Synod's use. It would seem, however, as if the two brethren excused their ungrateful conduct towards the Synod by looking on the "hundred dollars," not as a *benefaction*, but as a *bribe*, and as being an *evidence* of a *felonious intent* on the part of the Synod, of *putting its foot on their necks*!—It was for the purpose of illustrating the conduct of these men towards their benefactor, that a certain writer made use of the uncouth comparison of "a Hottentot knocking out the brains of his mother." The Remarker, then, is the wrong person to bring a charge of *ingratitude* against the Messrs. Gordons. *Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?*

We might thus continue at great length in pointing out the inconsistencies of which the Remarker is guilty, but we will only notice one more. On page 5, we meet with the following professions:—"So far as we know our own hearts, we have no desire to bring any groundless charges against our brethren who have treated us so unworthily. We trust we shall not so far transgress the law of Christ as to render 'evil for evil; or railing for railing.' It is our desire to repress every angry feeling, to bear with fortitude the injuries we have been called to suffer, and to leave the work of defamation and detraction to those who may think their cause requires it—conscious as we are that to revile is inconsistent with all christian duty, and is commonly resorted to by the most worthless, and practised upon the most deserving." So much for profession; let us now look at the practice. And here we might refer our readers, in general, to the matter, manner, spirit and temper of the Magazine, as a contradiction of the above professions, but that the thing may appear in its proper light, we will select a few specimens, and that with a special reference to the sentiment, that "*reviling is commonly resorted to by the most worthless and practised upon the most deserving.*"

* It is believed, that upon examination it will be found, that neither of these brethren has ever contributed *one cent* to the Synod's funds. We may have occasion to speak of the conduct of their congregations hereafter.

Thus the Magazine, leaving "the work of defamation and detraction" to others, charges the Synod with inflicting censures "without any just cause and even without any plausible pretext;" and "who, under the influence of unchristian feelings and motives, acted this strange and sinful part." The Synod is charged as being guilty of "sinful proceedings," "ill usage and persecution," and of treating "ministers with much indignity and cruelty,"—also of a "corrupt exercise of discipline,"—"oppressive measures," "tyranny and oppression;" of "adopting arbitrary and despotic principles in church policy," and doing as "the Popes of Rome did to get the people to countenance them in the exercise of their usurped authority;" and moreover, as being guilty of "unjust and arbitrary proceedings," and of having to a "great extent abandoned the principles and corrupted the discipline of the Secession Church." Again, the Remarker says, that "the decisions of the Synod were excessively arbitrary and presumptuous," "manifest a disregard to truth and honesty," and "show the extent to which men professing godliness will go, in trampling under foot all the claims of justice and equity, in order to accomplish their designs." Synod was guilty of "indecent transactions"—"all their proceedings seemed designed to screen the Presbytery from well merited contempt—nothing more unprincipled or unjust can well be imagined;" "found the libel proven in the absence of all testimony," which "Mr. Stark justly considered an outrage on all decency and perfect mockery of all that men regard as sacred and holy." Synod settled the question respecting the Albany Presbytery, "but it is believed in such a way as no other court on earth, except only the Associate Synod, would have settled such a question"—"the iniquity of the whole transaction can be easily made abundantly manifest"—"at variance with truth and righteousness"—and "rested on preambles which were untrue, and introduced apparently with a view to impose on the ignorant"—and thus "an outrageous proceeding." The Synod's assertion is "a sheer fiction, is entirely fallacious and deceptive," and their decision "rests wholly on misrepresentation and falsehood," and is "based entirely on falsehood and misrepresentation"—"a mere sophism which can impose only on the most ignorant." Synod's "two resolutions are mere gratuitous assertions which can impose only on the ignorant"—"are mere unfounded assertions and entitled to no credit nor respect whatever." Again, "This decision of Synod is an outrage on all decency, a violation of the most sacred principles of justice, and a most daring attempt to impose upon the credulity of the public." "The Synod persisted in the determination to abide by their corrupt decision though fully proved to be founded in falsehood"—and did "recklessly thunder out their anathemas, like 'a madman, who casteth firebrands, arrows and death.'"

These beautiful specimens of the Remarker's meekness and freedom from the use of all reviling language is wound up after the usual manner with a pious exhortation and a text of scripture, thus:—"For ourselves, we feel more pity than resentment towards those who have perpetrated those outrages of which there is so much reason to complain, and if we might presume to counsel them, we would earnestly admonish them to attend to the discharge of their important duties, which certainly would be a source of more satisfaction to them in a dying hour, than the reflection that they have labored to injure the reputation of their brethren. 'He that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil and his lips that they shall speak no guile.'" (pp. 28, 29.)

We have thus clearly shown that there is an awful discrepancy between the Remarker's professions and practice, respecting the use of reviling language; such discrepancy as convicts him of the most glaring inconsistency. It may be proper to remark that the above "specimens" are all taken from No. 1 of the Magazine, and are applied to the Associate Synod. We have passed by the harsh epithets which are lavishly applied to certain Presbyteries and individuals. Were we to proceed through all the Nos. which have appeared, and cull with care, the above catalogue might be increased to almost any extent. But we have already given to our readers what will be a *surfeit* of such shameless trash. And yet the Remarker, who indulges so freely in such coarseness and vulgarity of style, affected to be horrified at the terms which we employed in a single remark touching the *characteristics* of his Magazine; the justness and accuracy of which remark we feel perfectly willing to leave to the candid and unbiassed judgment of the christian community, especially after our Review shall have been brought to a close.

Leaving the inconsistencies of the Magazine, we will pass to a consideration of the *misquotations*, *garbling of authorities* and *falsifying of records*, with which it is interspersed.

In a former part of this Review we have convicted the editor of the Magazine of an *ecclesiastical forgery*, in palming on the Presbytery of Albany a fictitious resolution, instead of the one which they really passed.

On page 39, the editor makes Stewart of Pardovan say;—"An appeal made by parties should sist the execution of the sentence appealed from"—This, however, is but a part of the sentence, and is essentially modified by that which follows, viz:—"only while the appeal is duly and diligently prosecuted, and may thereby be determined, otherwise not." (Book iv. Tit. v. § 11.)

On the same page the Discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States is quoted, as follows:—"The necessary operation of an appeal is to suspend all further proceedings on the ground of the sentence appealed from." Here the editor stops, the words next following not answering his purpose so well:—"But if a sentence of suspension, or excommunication from church privileges, or of deposition from office, be the sentence appealed from, it shall be considered as in force until the appeal shall be issued." (Chap. vii. sec. iii. ¶ 15.)

On the same page, the overture for a new Book of Discipline in the Associate Church is made to say: "The effect of an appeal is to suspend all farther proceedings in the case, until the appeal be issued." This, however, is but a part of the rule, the remainder is as follows:—"From this general rule, however, edification requires that one exception should be made, viz: when the appeal is taken from a sentence of suspension, deposition or excommunication, which sentence shall be considered as in force till the appeal is issued. (ch. ix. § 9.)

The editor finding a rule in our own authorized Book of Discipline directly in the face of his whole argument, proceeds *first* to abuse it, and *secondly* to explain it away. (p. 39.) The rule referred to and partially quoted is the following: "When a protest and appeal is offered, the judicatory is to consider whether they will admit or reject them. If they admit, the cause is to be left to the judgment of the superior court; but if they reject they may proceed in the trial of it." It was according to this rule that the Presbytery of Cambridge acted, and

whose conduct in so doing is censured by the editor in the harshest terms. And because he saw that this rule justified the Presbytery in their procedure, he flies at it and abuses it to his heart's content, saying, "this rule is against the rules of Presbyterian Church government, and has a place in the discipline of none but the Associate Church." He admits that "the design of it evidently was to prevent a litigious defendant from protracting and embarrassing a trial by protesting unnecessarily at every step," but nevertheless, complains of it as being "against the rules of Presbyterian Church Government," and "unknown to the discipline of any but the Associate Church." And next he proceeds to explain it away, by saying: "It is manifest from the last sentence in this rule, that its application is only to protests against a 'part of the proceedings,' against an interlocutory sentence." But this explanation is directly contradicted by the remaining part of the rule, which reads thus: "The party may protest against the rejection of his protest; and if this is sustained, he may still bring the cause ultimately before the superior court; and if the *former protest was against* [not "a part of the proceedings" only, but] *a definitive sentence*, he may require a review of the whole case." (Form of Process, Art. XII.)

The Doctor, having whittled down his authorities to make them suit, *sums up* in quite a triumphant tone, as follows: "The Presbytery of Cambridge, then, show by their own minute, not only, that in opposition to the rules of procedure in Presbyterian courts, they proceeded, in the case of Dr. B. after protest and appeal had been taken to a superior court, but, that without cause they rejected an appeal from a final sentence, and without the authority of their own rule, and against the letter and spirit of every other, they *proceeded to execute the sentence*." (p. 40.)

On page 53, we meet with the following: "It has long been the established law in the Presbyterian church, that no Presbytery, unless it be a supreme court, possesses the power to depose a minister of the gospel in his absence. Dr. Bullions then has not been lawfully deposed." In proof of this assertion, we are referred to "Hill of Dailly's Practice of the Judicatories of the Church of Scotland." But this proof, if true, will by no means support the above declaration, unless the Presbyterian church in all its branches be governed by the "established law" spoken of; but this is not the case with any branch of that church in this country, as every one of them allows a Presbytery to exercise the power of deposing a minister in his absence. We repudiate the doctrine, that a law said to be passed by the Church of Scotland in 1755 is "established law in the Presbyterian church" in these United States. But we do not believe that the Church of Scotland ever passed such an absurd law as that referred to. And if we could lay our hand on Hill's Practice, we should expect to find him treated as the other authorities above noticed have been, viz: *misquoted and perverted*.

On page 138, Durham on Scandal is referred to, in order to sustain the despotic principle that a church judicatory ought never to allow the accused to defend himself on a charge of slander, the relevancy of which had been determined. The particular place, indeed, is not specified, and we apprehend there was a good reason for it. We deny that that distinguished author ever held to the absurd doctrine, which the Magazine imputes to him.

An instance of a very deliberate falsification of the Minutes of Synod

occurs on page 147. The Remarker says: "We intended to have submitted some remarks on the decision of the late Synod respecting Mr. Stark, but on examining their minutes *we find nothing on that subject but the following resolution*, which we give in their own words, viz: 'Resolved, That the former deed of Synod in his case be affirmed.' As we were not present," continues the Remarker, "when this resolution was passed, and as there are several deeds of Synod, in what they are pleased to call the case of Mr. Stark, it is *impossible* for us, from this minute, to say which of them may be meant." Now the *whole* minute from which the above resolution, as being *all* the Remarker could find on the subject, is selected, reads as follows: "On motion, proceeded to the unfinished business of last year. Agreed to take up the case of Mr. Stark. Mr. Stark was called, but not appearing, the following preamble and resolution were adopted, viz: Whereas, at the meeting of the Synod at Pittsburgh, in 1837, the Synod, according to the request of Mr. Stark and others, agreed to review the deed of the preceding Synod, convicting Mr. Stark of various offences: And, whereas Mr. Stark has withdrawn from the present meeting, therefore, *Resolved*, that the former deed of Synod in his case be affirmed." We leave the reader to make his own comments.

The Remarker gives us on page 15, an incorrect minute of the facts which occurred on the 18th of April, 1838, when the division took place in the Presbytery of Albany. He makes the minute, among other things, say: "Members present, Rev. Dr. P. Bullions, Messrs. Stark and Blair, ministers; together with Messrs. Whitewright, Brinkerhoff and Black, ruling elders.—The roll being called, Dr. Bullions gave notice that he withdrew his protest against the decision of Presbytery, excluding Mr. Stark from his seat.—Messrs. Blair and Stark also intimated that they withdrew their protests. Messrs. Campbell and Martin, together with Mr. Milmine, ruling elder from Florida, appeared and took their seats," &c. But the true minute, now in our possession, written at the time by Dr. Bullions, with a pencil, and bearing palpable evidence of great *trepidation and haste*, reads as follows, (there being neither day nor date prefixed,): "Presby. met and was constituted by prayer by the mod'r. Rev'd. P. B. was appointed clerk P. T. in the absence of the clerk. Mr. B. gave notice that he withdrew his protest against the deed of Presby. refusing Mr. Stark and his elder a seat in Presby. Mr. Blair did so also. Members present, Messrs. Bullions, Stark and Blair; Messrs. Whitewright, Brinkerhoff and Black, ruling elders. Messrs. Martin and Stark came and took their seats."

As Mr. Stark appears to have been the all absorbing subject, both of thought and action, with the clerk P. T., he did Mr. Campbell the indignity of inserting, in his great hurry and confusion, Mr. Stark's name instead of his. The minute should have been, "Messrs. Martin and Campbell came and took their seats." The reader will perceive some considerable discrepancy as to facts between the true minute and that published in the Magazine. According to the latter the absurdity was committed of making Mr. Stark a constituent member of the court at its opening, and afterwards proceeding to constitute him a member a second time by the withdrawal of protests; but according to the former, the absurdity was committed of admitting him to a seat upon the withdrawal of protests by Messrs. Bullions and Blair, while his own protest was not withdrawn. For it was not till Mr. Martin afterwards asked, Whether Mr. Stark had also withdrawn his protest? that Mr.

Stark arose and said. "Moderator, I now withdraw it." Our only design, however, in noticing this discrepancy, is to show that no dependence whatever can be placed on the statements of the Magazine respecting facts. For according to either way, and indeed every way that the matter can be viewed, it is perfectly absurd and ridiculous to suppose that the mere withdrawal of protests annihilated the deed of the Presbytery against which they had been entered, some ten months before.

In the minute which the Remarker publishes, the following is given as the resolution which Dr. Bullions took from his pocket and offered on that occasion: "Whereas the Rev. Messrs. Martin and Campbell have acted in opposition to a decision of Synod, in depriving Mr. Stark and the elder from his congregation of their seats in Presbytery, therefore, Resolved, that they be excluded from their seats in Presbytery, till they submit to the authority of Synod." The *real* resolution, however, which Dr. Bullions, who was under process for scandal, and to be tried that day, *did* offer, was simply as follows: "Resolved, that Messrs. Campbell and Martin, together with their elders, be suspended from seats in Presbytery, because of their opposition to the Associate Synod." On reflection it was found that it would never answer to publish this resolution to the world, not only on account of the *indefiniteness* of the charge brought against the individuals named, but also, because, as it happened, the elders to be disciplined were not the same that voted for Mr. Stark's exclusion, and besides Mr. Martin's elder had not as yet appeared to claim his seat. Hence to avoid these absurdities the resolution has been moulded into a different shape—a *Preamble* containing the crime, and a *Resolve* the punishment. And what is the crime in its more *definite* form? Simply this, a voting against a motion made by Dr. P. Bullions on the 28th June, 1837, to have Mr. Stark's name put on the roll of Presbytery! Messrs. Martin and Campbell did not *deprive* Mr. Stark of a seat in Presbytery. They only *voted* along with a number of other members against the motion just specified! Dr. Bullions, however, who was to be tried that day, probably thought, that as these brethren had been wicked enough to vote against his *motion*, they might be guilty of voting against *himself*; and therefore, that the best thing that could be done in the premises, was to *suspend them from their seats in the Presbytery*, together with their unoffending elders also!*

* The true history of the proceedings of those individuals who affected to be acting as the Presbytery of Albany on the occasion referred to, not only shows, that Mr. Stark and his elder were admitted to seats contrary to common sense and established order, under the *sham* of withdrawing protests in order to nullify the deed against which they had been entered; but also, that this disorderly constituted court, in the most tyrannical manner, suspended the right of protest and appeal; and did, moreover, undertake to eject four members from their seats, for no other reason assigned or assignable, than that they had not on a former occasion *voted satisfactorily*. Now, taking all these things into the account, and also that the liberty of speech had been virtually taken away, how could the Synod have possibly decided otherwise than they did, viz: that a body thus constituted and thus acting could not have been a regular Presbyterian court; and that the other "body, of which Messrs. Campbell and Martin were members, was truly the Associate Presbytery of Albany?" Had the circumstances of this case been fully understood in Synod, it is believed that there would not have been more than two or three dissenting votes. After specifying all the above circumstances, the minute of the transaction as recorded in the Presbytery's Book, concludes as follows, and to which every honest-hearted Presbyterian will cordially respond: "When these two brethren [Messrs. Campbell and Martin] saw, that it was useless to reason with men who seemed to be madly bent on disorder and injustice; and considering that it would be unfaithful and sinful in them to acknowledge such a disorderly constituted and violent body to be the Associate Presbytery of Albany, they declared that they could not regard them as a lawfully constituted Presbytery, protested against them, and gave notice that they would retire to another place and constitute the Presbytery of Albany, and transact such business as might come before them,"—which they accordingly did; and the Synod has decided, and every sensible and unbiassed mind must also decide, that **THEY DID RIGHT**.

We had intended to have noticed particularly the dangerous principles, which are either *doctrinally* or *practically* set forth in the Magazine; but we find our limits will hardly permit us to do any thing more than merely to state some of these in the briefest manner possible.

It seems to be a principle running throughout the Magazine, that our submission to the decisions of church courts must be determined by our own good pleasure.

The editor of the Magazine has obviously given his sanction to the infidel principle, that church courts ought to be regarded and treated as assemblages of selfish, corrupt, wicked, unprincipled and designing men, who commit the greatest outrages under the garb of zeal for righteousness and truth. (pp. 3, 82.)

He also advances the principle that it is Popish for church courts to claim respect and obedience to their decisions; and that to admit such a claim would be a renunciation of Protestantism. (pp. 4, 71.)

He adopts the principle that it is Popish for a church court to inflict censure on any of its members for insubordination and contempt. (p. 71.)

Contrary to the doctrine of the Secession church, the Magazine justifies the principle that an act of mal-administration will warrant a rebellion on the part of the aggrieved; nay, a separation from the fellowship of the church. (p. 26.)

The Remarker lays down the novel principle in discipline, that finding a charge *relevant*, (i. e. censurable if true,) is equivalent to its *probation*. (pp. 11, 138.)

He also maintains the despotic principle, that a person charged with publishing slander ought not to be allowed the privilege of defence. Such a principle may answer for the meridian of Rome, Constantinople, or St. Petersburg, but not for the Associate Church in North America. (p. 138.)

The Remarker practically adopts the principle of the Jesuits, that the frequent repetition of a falsehood may at length induce some to believe it. It is only on this principle, that we can account for his repeating some twenty times the same falsehoods, and that too after they had been most amply refuted.

He, in like manner also, adopts and acts on the principle of the French atheists, that by casting plenty of dirt on an opponent some of it will be apt to stick. Hence the unsparing hand with which he scatters filth at those whom he denounces as "enemies and persecutors."

He has also practically adopted the principle that "all is fair in politics." Hence his taking advantage of unguarded expressions, his intrigue, his appeals to national feeling, his flattery of partizans, his wholesale slanders, &c. &c.

Such are some of the disorganising and destructive principles which are to be found in the Magazine, either shamelessly avowed or secretly acted on. We have not time to be more explicit, at present, in the proof and illustration of them. And it is but justice to state, that probably the Remarker may disavow some of them, since they are not expressly asserted by him, but only legitimately inferred from his reasoning and the nature of his acts.

One thing, however, will appear obvious to every person that carefully peruses the Magazine, that its editor, from an apparent dread of Popery, has gone off into the opposite extreme of Independency,—and Independency too of the laxest kind, even bordering on wild confusion and absolute anarchy; while at the same time, in some things, he goes

beyond even the worst of Popery; as for example, attempting to discipline members of a court for giving unsatisfactory votes.

And by the way, as to the charge of Popery, which the Remarker so frequently and so unblushingly brings against the Associate Synod, no person seems to regard it in any other light than as "a matter of course." About three months since, being in conversation with a venerable father and long tried friend of the cause which the Remarker and his associates have abandoned, he said to us, that he had attended the meetings of the Associate Synod regularly for more than thirty years, and that this was not the first time the cry of Popery had been raised against the Synod. For when Mr. Campbell (the father of Campbellism) was deposed for heresy, he charged the Synod with Popery; when Mr. Duncan was deposed for certain errors, he raised the cry of Popery; when Mr. Kirkland was deposed for his misdemeanors, he too raised the cry of Popery; and hence, said he, it was to be expected that the lately suspended brethren would, in like manner, raise the cry of Popery against the Synod. Being so accustomed to hear the cry of Popery raised, he seemed to take it quite easy; and his remarks did not fail to convince us, that this indeed was the common resource of all our "modern martyrs of discipline."

Before closing there is one other point which requires some notice from us, viz: the process conducted against Dr. P. Bullions before the Presbytery of Albany. The charges involved in this process are published in the Magazine, (p. 24,) and are as follows:

"1. Insubordination; in having preached, as admitted by himself, in the First Associate Congregation of New-York, when both it and its pastor were acting in opposition to the authority of the Associate Synod.

"2. Misrepresenting and slandering this Presbytery, in a communication addressed to the Associate Synod, and marked No. 24, in the published minutes of Synod for 1837.

"3. Misrepresenting certain facts, connected with the case of Mr. Webster, in a paper given to Mr. Stark, which has been published, and which was also read in Synod at its last meeting; thereby injuring both the cause of truth and individual character."

These charges, the editor of the Magazine says, were "contrived against him by a party in the Presbytery, because he refused to countenance them in their sinful proceedings." He states further, that "these charges were considered by the Presbytery, after Messrs. Campbell and Martin retired on the 18th April, and found to be altogether inadmissible. The first, because it stood opposed to the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, to 'preach the gospel to every creature.' And the other two, because they contained merely vague assertions, without any specification, and against which it would be utterly impossible for any person to defend himself. After this the papers referred to, and on which it was alleged that the charges were founded, were read and examined, and found to contain only statements that were well known to be true." (p. 24.)

The notice which the Remarker thus takes of this affair will surely justify us in presenting to our readers a correct state of the case, although his character may suffer by our so doing.

On the first charge little need be said. The facts charged are all admitted. Mr. Stark was lying under a sentence of suspension, pro-

nounced by the Synod; he had also declined the authority of the Synod; his congregation adhered to him, and also disowned the authority of the Synod; they refused to admit to their pulpit the ministers sent to them by the Synod, to intimate the aforesaid sentence of suspension, and to preach the gospel; the Presbytery of Albany had judicially declared said congregation to be in a state of rebellion; and moreover, the Presbytery, only a few days before the offence charged was committed, had unanimously, in the presence of Dr. Bullions, expressed their judgment, that for any of our ministers in present circumstances, to preach in Mr. Stark's congregation would be inconsistent, disorderly and offensive. But notwithstanding of all these facts and circumstances, Dr. Bullions went and preached in said congregation, and that too, as we were informed, in such a manner and style as was calculated to countenance and encourage that people in their schismatical and disorderly course. Could the Presbytery, then, feel otherwise than aggrieved at such conduct on the part of Dr. Bullions? Were they not justifiable in dealing with him for the same? And had he not *justified* his conduct, when first spoken to on the subject, the Presbytery would probably have let the matter drop. But having put himself in the attitude of defence, the Presbytery agreed to let the matter lie over for further consideration; and at the next ensuing meeting it was put, along with other matters, into the hands of a committee, who reported a minute embracing the foregoing charges, which was adopted by the Presbytery; and Dr. Bullions not being present, it was agreed that he should be cited to answer to said charges on the 18th of April, 1838.

The Dr. in his great wisdom so managed it as to have a Presbytery so constituted at the appointed time, as to secure him, if not a *just* and *honorable*, at least a *certain* acquittal. Accordingly, after Mr. Stark and his elder had been admitted to seats, and Messrs. Campbell and Martin and their elders thrust from theirs, the *court* (!) decided that this first charge was "altogether inadmissible, because opposed to the commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, to 'preach the gospel to every creature.'" It was by this "commandment" that the Dr. had attempted to justify his conduct before the Presbytery when the matter was first called up; but the court, as *then* constituted, was of the opinion that he was guilty of putting a forced construction upon it. This "commandment" is unquestionably subject to many limitations. The gospel is to be preached only to *human* creatures, and who are living on *earth*, and to whom Providence gives the opportunity. Besides, the gospel is only to be preached to people, when it can be done in a *regular* way—in a way consistent with good order, and not in open violation of the divine ordinance of government and discipline. There are some from whom ministers of the gospel are to "turn away;" against some they are to "shake off the dust of their feet for a memorial;" to some the Spirit forbids the gospel to be preached. But we are dwelling too long on this point, as we can scarcely believe there are any who will coincide in opinion with the Doctor's court, that this first charge is "altogether inadmissible."

The second charge was founded on the following notice, which appeared in the published minutes of Synod for 1837: "No. 24. A complaint by the Rev. Peter Bullions against the Presbytery of Albany, for withholding certain testimony, which he deemed necessary in order to enable him to prosecute an appeal which he had taken from said Presbytery."

As soon as the minutes of Synod were published, the Presbytery, perceiving that Dr. Bullions had been misrepresenting and slandering them before the Synod, if the above notice were correct, immediately called him to account. He said, that the Clerk of Synod had not fairly represented the nature of his communication to the Synod, and promised to get a copy of it and show it to the Presbytery. Whereupon the matter was laid over till next meeting; at which meeting, the Doctor having failed to present a copy of the communication in question, the Presbytery referred the matter to a committee, as above noticed. And the reader will perceive that the charge could not be made more *definite* than it was, as it was based upon the *notice* published in the minutes of Synod; all the Presbytery desiring was, that Dr. Bullions might exonerate himself from the misrepresentation and slander which appeared on the *face* of that notice. The Presbytery have since, however, been furnished by the Synod with a copy of the communication referred to, and it is found beyond all gainsaying to establish the charge brought against Dr. P. Bullions of "misrepresenting and slandering the Presbytery of Albany." With the exception of two or three sentences at the close, the communication complained of is as follows:

"To the Associate Synod of N. America to meet at Pittsburgh on the 4th Wednesday of May, 1837.

"The representation and petition of the subscriber humbly sheweth— That on the trial of Chauncey Webster before the Associate Presbytery of Albany, for slander and defamation, a protest and appeal was entered by the Rev. A. Stark, in which he was joined by the subscriber, against some parts of the procedure of said Presbytery and against some of their decisions, as in their judgment a violation of order and justice; that this protest and appeal was not prosecuted before Synod, because a copy of testimony deemed important for that end, though solicited, could not be obtained; particularly testimony going to show that Mr. Webster in publishing his slanderous pamphlet was influenced by bad advice; that application was made by Mr. Stark to Synod last May, to obtain through Synod from Presbytery, the testimony referred to without success; that the subscriber applied to the Presbytery of Albany at their last meeting, requesting as a favor to be permitted still to prosecute his appeal, which the Presbytery did not see fit to grant. In this way the grievances of the subscriber, with the course of procedure, and with several of the decisions of Presbytery, remain as they were, without, as he thinks, any neglect on his part, &c.

"ALBANY, May 5th, 1837.

P. BULLIONS."

That the Presbytery of Albany is misrepresented and slandered in the above document will appear when the following facts are considered:

1. Mr. Stark never protested against any decision of the Presbytery, as is here stated by Dr. Bullions. After the first decision was made by the Presbytery in the case of the libel against Mr. Webster, the minutes of Presbytery say: "Mr. Stark asked leave to protest, *if he see cause*, against this and any subsequent decision in the case. This was granted." But Mr. Stark *never saw cause* to enter a protest against any of those decisions.

2. Dr. P. Bullions entered no such protest as he speaks of in his letter. Two days after Mr. Stark had "asked leave," as above, and when the whole libel was gone through with, the minutes state, that "Mr. Bullions asked permission to protest against any of the above decisions

he may deem proper. This was granted." But he never deemed it proper to use the permission thus given him.

3. It is, therefore, as wide of the truth as any thing can be, to assert as the Doctor does in his letter, that he *joined Mr. Stark* in his protest and appeal. About two months before the time referred to, he protested jointly with Mr. Stark against a resolution of the Presbytery in relation to the "civil suit;" which resolution is given in a preceding part of this Review. And this was the only *joint protest* that was entered in the whole matter, from beginning to end.

4. Mr. Stark had no reason to complain of a withholding of testimony from him, as he would not enter, according to a requisition of the Presbytery, any specific protest against any of their decisions. The minutes of Presbytery, towards the close of the same meeting at which he asked leave to protest, if he should see cause, contain this record: "In relation to a request of Mr. Stark for extracts of the minutes and a copy of the testimony in the case of Mr. Webster, as far as he, Mr. Stark was concerned, which request has been already granted, but Mr. Stark not having entered his protest against any of the decisions of Presbytery in a specific form—Therefore, Resolved that the above grant be suspended, as far as a copy of testimony is concerned, till he state the particular decisions against which he may protest." Now any person will see that Mr. Stark could not have felt himself very strongly aggrieved by the decisions of the Presbytery, if he did not know which of them to protest against, without first having the privilege of conning over the testimony, in order to see whether he could find ground sufficiently strong to bear a *quibble*. If he did not know what decisions to protest against, surely the Presbytery were not bound to come to his aid by offering him the use of the testimony in question. But notwithstanding of the above resolution, the clerk on his own responsibility *did* furnish Mr. Stark with, as he supposed, all the testimony in the case relating to him personally. It appeared afterwards, however, that the unimportant testimony of two or three witnesses had not been furnished. Again,

5. It is not true that Dr. Bullions asked for a copy of any testimony given on Mr. Webster's trial, till at least eighteen months afterwards. Now,

6. After all this, is it not a great departure from the truth, to represent the Presbytery as withholding a copy of the testimony, and thereby *preventing the prosecution of an appeal* which, in fact, was never taken? This surely is misrepresenting and slandering the Presbytery; and especially when they are complained of for withholding "testimony going to show, that Mr. Webster in publishing his slanderous pamphlet was influenced by bad advice." Not a particle of any such testimony was ever withheld; because no such testimony was ever in the power of the Presbytery to give.

7. When Dr. Bullions asked leave, about a year and a half after Mr. Webster's case was settled, to prosecute his appeal, he was distinctly informed that he had never taken any appeal from any decision in that case; and besides, all the foregoing facts were at that time brought particularly before him, and he acknowledged that he could find no fault with the Presbytery for not then granting his request; and yet two days afterwards he sits down and writes the foregoing letter to the Associate Synod! And he gravely tells the Synod that it was "not owing to any neglect on his part that his grievances remained!" Oh no! The Presbytery is to blame for his not protesting! The Presbytery is

to blame for withholding testimony which he never asked! The Presbytery is to blame for withholding testimony they never had in their power to give! The Presbytery is to blame for not allowing him, at the expiration of eighteen months, to do what no court could consistently allow to be done! We may now surely leave it to the candid reader to decide, whether the foregoing letter does not most abundantly prove this second charge, brought against Dr. P. Bullions, of "misrepresenting and slandering the Presbytery of Albany?"

The third charge against the Doctor was founded on a letter written by him to Mr. Stark, which Mr. Stark first published, *anonymously*, (finding it to answer his purpose well,) and afterwards presented to Synod, May, 1837. The letter is without date, but was written, it seems, in December 1836, immediately upon the appearance of the Presbytery's Narrative, and apparently designed to counteract the testimony of Messrs. Campbell and Smart, as published in said Narrative.

After inserting Mr. Webster's "paper of retraction," prefaced by the remark that he had *copied* it at Mr. Stark's request, (though it had been given to Mr. Stark under the solemn pledge, that *he was to make no use of it whatever*;) the Doctor writes as follows:

"The above was in the hand writing of Ch. Webster, and the passage inclosed in a parenthesis was interlined, and indistinctly written. On the morning of the 10th after the opening of Presbytery, Mr. Stark stated to Presbytery that the above retraction, he was happy to say, was entirely satisfactory to him, and that he would consequently withdraw the civil suit against Mr. W. He then read it and handed it to the Clerk of the Presbytery, requesting it to be recorded in the minutes. The Rev. Mr. Smart had the paper in his hand, and was either reading it or speaking about it, when Mr. Webster came into court, took the paper out of the hands of the clerk, saying the Presbytery had no business with it, as it was a private paper, and then went to his seat and tore it in pieces. He afterwards rose and said that though he gave that retraction to Mr. Stark the night before, yet after he reflected on it through the night and sought the best counsel he could get, he could not make a retraction so full as that was; that he resolved to come into Presbytery and state the matter, and throw himself on the Presbytery. He then stated, that the retraction as first written was not so full; that he had written it first, 'containing *some* statements injurious to the character and standing of the Rev. A. Stark of New-York, which are hereby fully withdrawn;' that as this was not satisfactory to Mr. Stark, it was altered to its present form. Being asked whether the alterations were made with his consent, he distinctly and expressly admitted, that they were, saying, 'I admit that too,' and added some remarks which I did not understand and do not now remember.

"The above is a true statement, to the best of my remembrance, and which I am willing to confirm by oath, if called to give testimony respecting it.

"P. BULLIONS."

Now the charge against the Doctor is, that, in this letter, he has "misrepresented certain facts, to the injury of the cause of truth and individual character." Let us see whether the charge can be substantiated.

1. He asserts, and intends to have it so understood that the so called "paper of retraction" was *in the hand writing of Ch. Webster*; whereas, according to the sworn testimony of the committee, Messrs. Smart and Campbell, that which contained the very *gist* of the retraction, was

in the hand writing of Mr. Stark, and had never obtained the assent of Mr. Webster, viz: the word *all* interlined instead of the original word *some*, making the sentence read "all the statements injurious to the character and standing of Mr. Stark," instead of "some of the statements, &c." as Mr. Webster had written it. Besides this, according to the testimony of the above named witnesses, there were other interlineations, not in Mr. Webster's hand writing.

2. The Doctor represents Mr. Webster as acknowledging in the morning that he had given the paper in question to Mr. Stark the night before, in good earnest, as his *retraction*; and consequently that his taking it back was a violation of his faith and honor; whereas the above witnesses declare that said paper was given with *reluctance*, and as a paper *still under negotiation*, which might be altered or amended by either party; and consequently that Mr. Webster had a right, if he chose, to recall it and do with it as he pleased.

3. Mr. Smart testifies, that Mr. Webster took the paper from off the table where Mr. Stark had laid it; but the Doctor asserts, that he took it out of Mr. Smart's hand while he "was either reading it or speaking about it."

4. Mr. Webster intimated that he had laid the matter before the Throne of Grace, and felt persuaded that he would neither be doing justice to himself nor the cause of truth, to give so general a retraction as that contained in the "paper" spoken of; but Dr. Bullions so states this circumstance as to favor the calumny, then put in circulation, that a certain member or members of the Presbytery had *counselled* Mr. Webster during the night to withdraw the said paper, when the Presbytery would come together in the morning.

5. After stating, that Mr. Webster replied to a certain question by saying, "I admit that too," the Doctor adds: "and he added some remarks which I did not understand and do not now remember." But these "remarks" he should have "understood and remembered," as they modified and put an entirely different face on the *admission* referred to. It was ourself that put the question to Mr. Webster: "Were not those interlineations made with your consent?" To which he replied, "I admit that too, because the paper was a *paper under negotiation*, and those interlineations were permitted that they might be taken under consideration." Hence this *suppressio veri* (this keeping back of a part of the truth) on the part of the doctor, is tantamount to a misrepresentation of an important fact in the history of the case before us.

Now it need scarcely be added, that the above misrepresentations were calculated to "injure both the cause of truth and individual character." If they were believed, not only would they injure the character of Mr. Webster, but more especially that of the witnesses, Messrs. Smart and Campbell, nay, of other members of the Presbytery of Albany. The Presbytery, therefore, were under obligation to notice the above statements of Dr. Bullions, especially as he had professed a willingness, apparently with the view of giving them the greater effect, to confirm the truth of them under the solemnity of an oath.

It may be necessary to state further in relation to the above charges, that Dr. Bullions not appearing before the Presbytery after being cited three several times, that court entered upon the consideration of them, found them proved, added to them the additional offence of *contumacy*, and for the same, *in cumulo*, suspended him from the exercise of the

ministry and from the communion of the church, till he shall have given the requisite satisfaction.

Now let our readers examine carefully the nature and proof of the above charges, and decide for themselves, how far the editor of the Magazine is deserving of credit, in saying: "This process was neither more nor less than some vexatious and inadmissible charges contrived against him by a party in the Presbytery, because he refused to countenance them in their sinful proceedings. The papers referred to, on which it was alleged that the charges were founded, were read and examined [by the pretended Presbytery] and found to contain only statements that were *well known to be true*." And let them also decide upon the *justice* and *honesty* displayed in the following sentence, which is given by his correspondent, as proof of the mildness and excellence of the "Rejected Resolutions;" "The conduct of Messrs. Campbell and Martin in forming themselves into a presbytery, and suspending Dr. P. B. for preaching the gospel on a Sabbath day, in Mr. Stark's congregation, &c. &c. were to be passed over without formal rebuke." (p. 154.)

In addition to the foregoing letters of Dr. P. Bullions, it may be proper to introduce in this place another, which he addressed to his friend Dr. A. Bullions, and which was also presented and read in Synod, May, 1837. It is as follows:

"ALBANY, May 5th, 1837.

"Dear Sir—In answer to your enquiry, whether I think the testimony given by me is sufficient proof that Mr. Stark is the author of the Anonymous Pamphlets ascribed to him—I answer; that testimony is the foundation of the *opinion* expressed by me on that occasion, yet it might be very unjust to Mr. Stark to convict him on that testimony; for an opinion may arise from circumstances very insufficient to prove a matter before a court. The opinion I had of Mr. S. being the author of the 'K. paper' was equally strong with that of his being the author of the Pamphlets; but from what I have learned since, I am now satisfied that the former opinion was wrong, and that he was not the author of the K. paper."

"Yours respectfully,
P. BULLIONS."

"Rev. Dr. BULLIONS.

On this singular communication a few things must be said. If properly considered, it must appear to every person not only as a *crooked* but also as a *curious* affair. Here we have Dr. A. Bullions, who, as a member of Synod, was a *judge* in the case, appealing to the *witness* for an opinion respecting the sufficiency of his testimony towards convicting the accused! And here we have the witness sitting in judgment on his own testimony, and sending his verdict up to the court, with the view of enlightening the judges and warning them against laying too much stress on said testimony! But further, both the interrogatory put to the witness and his answer are based on an exceedingly erroneous supposition, viz: that the testimony of said witness was *all* the testimony that was presented in the case. This is so far from being true, that even without the testimony of this witness there would have been sufficient for the conviction of Mr. Stark. The internal evidence contained in the anonymous pamphlets, and especially the evidence arising from a certain "note," confirmed as it was by the testimony of Messrs. Campbell, Law and Kirkpatrick, was every way sufficient to convince the unprejudiced that Mr. Stark was the author of the pamphlets re-

ferred to. Indeed, laying Dr. P. Bullions' testimony entirely out of the question, who doubts that Mr. S. was the author of those infamous pamphlets? Dr. Bullions' testimony, however, has put the matter not only beyond the reach of doubt, if any remained, but beyond the reach even of a *reasonable cavil*.

The Doctor states in this letter, that he had testified to certain facts which were sufficient to *convince* him, or give rise to the *opinion* in his mind, that Mr. Stark was guilty; but he gravely admonishes the judges in the case, that "it *might* be very unjust to Mr. Stark to convict him on that testimony." As, however, it was not the *opinion* of the witness, but the *facts* given by him, that the court was concerned with, let us hear what they were. And they may be summed up in a single sentence, as follows: "I received," says the witness, "the manuscript copy of one of the Anonymous Pamphlets in the hand writing of Mr. Stark, accompanied with a letter from him, requesting, I think, that it should be published, which was accordingly done; I myself paying one dollar towards defraying the expense of publication." Now, if the witness did not perjure himself, how could it be "very unjust to Mr. Stark to convict him on that testimony?" Could any thing be more plain and positive? And yet, by this letter, an endeavor is made to create a doubt in the mind of Synod as to Mr. Stark's guilt?

With respect to the remaining part of this letter, relative to the "K. paper," language fails to describe our abhorrence of the witness's conduct in the attempt which he makes to destroy his own testimony. His testimony, given in under oath before the Presbytery of Albany, and which, in this letter he would have us discredit, was as follows: "I received a letter from a gentleman stating that he had a piece, [the K. paper,] which if I thought proper to insert in the Monitor, [being the editor at that time,] he would send on; and that he did not think there would be any objection to publish it, as there was nothing personal in it; but that it would be forwarded only on condition that his concern in it should not be known to the public. I acquiesced in this, and if the paper was not personal, and I thought proper, I would insert it. I thought that the best way to comply with the condition was to send a transcript. [viz: to Mr. Webster, the publisher.] I gave the original copy to Luke F. Newland to be transcribed. The transcript came to the publisher through the post office. I believe that the original copy of the paper and the letter were both in the hand writing of the Rev. A. Stark."

When Mr. Stark was thus proved guilty, and was lying under the odium of a wilful falsehood, in having repeatedly denied the authorship of the "K. paper," the story was invented that that paper had really been *written* by a person who shortly afterwards left the country, and that Mr. Stark had merely transcribed and forwarded it to Dr. Bullions, who was at that time the editor of the Monitor. But this story cannot be true, because it stands directly opposed to facts, which all the ingenuity of man can never set aside. In the above testimony it is declared that Mr. Stark wished to have *his concern* in the "paper" *concealed*. What other *concern* could he refer to than the *authorship*? It could not be the concern of *transcribing* it; for that he himself could easily have avoided by sending the original copy, which, being in the hand writing of a stranger, the publisher could have known nothing about; and this would have saved the trouble of a *re-transcribing* in Albany, as there would have been no necessity for this in order to "conceal Mr. Stark's

concern in it!" Besides, if according to the story, the real author was a foreigner and soon after left the country, how came Mr. Stark, as was proved by three different witnesses, to attempt to create the impression that the author of that paper was no other than Dr. P. Bullions himself? Again, how could that strange gentleman have begun the "K. paper" with the same sentence with which Mr. Stark had begun a sermon which was not at that time published? Moreover, if this new fangled story have any truth in it, it presents Mr. Stark in no very enviable light; for, according to the testimony above given, it must present him in the light of a *plagiarist*—of a person playing a gross imposition upon the editor of the Monitor, who was led to believe that Mr. Stark was indeed the author of the paper in question! But who can believe, if Mr. Stark had only been the transcriber of that paper, that he would not have given his friend the editor some hint of the fact?

Now with all these facts before him, facts which are incontrovertible, and which must convince every person of common sense that Mr. Stark was the author of the "K. paper," the Rev. Dr. P. Bullions, in opposition to his own testimony, declares in his letter that he is *now satisfied that Mr. Stark was not the author of the K. paper!*

We confess that we were much surprised at the decisions of Synod in 1837, respecting the case of Mr. Stark, but after receiving and duly considering the above three letters of Dr. P. Bullions, which were presented and read in Synod, our surprise in a great measure ceased. For honest minds, who were comparatively unacquainted with the case, must have been greatly perplexed and misled by those letters, coming from one who was supposed to be a principal witness, and who, after having given his testimony under oath before his presbytery, does, in this informal and *unsworn* manner, volunteer statements which are calculated to throw over it an air of suspicion and doubt.

We cannot account for the last of the above letters of Dr. Bullions, unless it be, that his conscience having thrown him off his guard while giving his testimony, he happened to tell too much truth, and that he wrote this letter with the view of recalling or at least weakening the force of the more important parts of it. For let it be recollected that he occupied about two hours and a half in giving his testimony, which, had he been of a "willing mind," might have been given in less than one-fourth part of that time. A considerable portion of the time alluded to was spent by the witness in giving *evasive* answers, or refusing to answer at all, to the questions put to him by the court; and it was not till after long and close dealing with his *conscience*, by reminding him of the nature of his oath, of his obligation to tell *the whole truth*, of the Being in whose presence he stood, of his fearful responsibility, &c., that the court obtained from him what they supposed to be the truth in the case. But now, it would seem, he repents of his conduct in allowing the Presbytery to *draw* out of him so much truth to the injury of a *colleague*, and therefore the Associate Synod must be informed, that he has *changed his opinion*, at least in one important point; or to use his own language, that "he is now satisfied that his former opinion was wrong, and that Mr. Stark was not the author of the K. paper;" and with regard to the Anonymous Pamphlets, Synod must also be told, that it *might be unjust*, notwithstanding his testimony, to convict Mr. Stark of their authorship!

In closing our Review, we think that we are entitled to say, that we

have now made good and established beyond all doubt the correctness of the opinion formerly expressed by us in relation to the contents of this *Ass. Presbyterian Magazine*, viz: "That they harmonize most completely with the contents of Mr. Stark's Anonymous Pamphlets,—and contain an uninterrupted tissue of falsehood, misrepresentation, slander, Jesuitical sophistry, and pitiful quibbling, which probably has not been far surpassed by any infidel or Popish writer since the era of the Reformation."

It is supposed, that some of our readers will conclude that the editor of the Magazine will surely retract the misstatements and slanders which we have proved upon him; but we have no such confidence in his honesty and candor: On the contrary we suppose he will treat us as he has done our correspondent, "A Transylvanian," viz., select a few unimportant statements, call them the *most important*, and then *assert*, without any shadow of proof, or at best without any more than a quibble, that they are *falsehoods, wilful falsehoods*; and at the same time interlarding the spontaneous effusions of his mind, as usual, with an abundance of hard and ribaldish epithets. But we are determined to keep him both to the *point* and to the *proof*.

We expect that some who are under the influence of prejudice, or at least possessed of *great sensibility*, will blame us for exposing as we have done the editor of the Magazine. This, however, we cannot help; especially as we have long since found, that there are always some weaklings in society who think it less a crime to falsify, than to expose the falsifier to the gaze of an abused and justly indignant community.

On a re-perusal of a former part of this Review, we think it probable, that an attempt will be made to create the impression that we have been justifying all that Mr. Webster published in his pamphlet. This, however, we disclaim. Nothing was farther from our intention. Indeed, Mr. W. himself, shortly after he had published his pamphlet, became convinced that there were a few things in it which he could not prove, and in the most candid manner he offered to retract them; but Mr. Stark would not accept of this, but insisted on a retraction of those things which both parties knew to be true; and because Mr. W. could not in conscience do this, he had to pay Mr. Stark *four hundred dollars* as the *price of his character*.

Finally, in answer to those who may charge us of being guilty of "answering a fool according to his folly," it is sufficient to say, that we have endeavored to act according to Matthew Henry's view of the Scripture referred to. After stating that there are cases, in which it would be wrong to "answer a fool according to his folly," such as—"If he tell one great lie, do not thou tell another; if he calumniate thy friend, do not thou calumniate his; if he banter, do not answer him in his own language, &c."—"Yet in other cases," says he, "a wise man will use his wisdom for the conviction of a fool, and when by taking notice of what he saith there may be hopes of *doing good*, or at least *preventing* further *mischief*, either to himself or others. If thou have reason to think that thy silence will be deemed an evidence of the weakness of thy cause, or of thine own weakness, in such a case *answer him*; and let it be an answer *ad hominem*; beat him at his own weapons, and that will be an answer *ad rem*, or as good as one. If he offer any thing that looks like an argument, answer that, and suit thine answer to his case. If he think, because thou dost not answer him,

what he saith is unanswerable, then give him an answer, *lest he be wise in his own conceit and boast of a victory.*" (See *Henry's Commentary on Prov. XXVI. 4, 5.*)

ART. II. *Partiality of God.*

If Universalism be true, the following shows how unjust and partial a being God must be. The argument it embodies, never has been, and never can be fairly met. It places Universalism not only in an absurd, but a most ludicrous position. The writer is the Rev. Mr. Hall, of Portsmouth, N. H.—*Zion's Herald*.

The partiality of the Ruler of the world is evinced also, according to Universalism, in the happy removal of the wicked from earth to heaven, while righteous survivors are still subjected to many sorrows.

The more profligate a man becomes, the more does he shorten his life. According to an inspired proverb the wicked do not live out half their days. They die and are borne to heaven, if Universalism may be credited. Having finished their course with joy, having run a race of glaring iniquity, having contended not against the enemies of the soul, but against the cause of holiness and the servants of God to the last moment, having won the crown of public infamy, having become meet for an inheritance with the devil and his angels, they are ushered by the ministering spirits to the abode of the blessed. The glories of heaven beam around them; the bliss of heaven fills their bosoms; the Holy one lavishes upon them the warmest commendations. But where are the miserable survivors, the devout men whose peace they loved to disturb, whose piety they love to deride, whose beneficent plans they love to embarrass? They are doomed to remain in this vale of tears, to breast additional opposition from the replenished ranks of the enemies of godliness. They must weep and struggle for many a tedious year, before the time of their release shall come. They may yet outlive another annoying generation of the ungodly, before they can be discharged from their earthly imprisonment.

Thus the antediluvians were hurried from a life of insufferable wickedness to a heavenly home; and as they looked down from heaven, with what feelings did they observe the faithful Noah as he pursued his lonely voyage over a buried world? With what emotions did they witness his subsequent misfortunes? They could thank God that they were now safe and happy in heaven, while the inmates of the ark were doomed to spend on earth additional years of perplexity and sorrow. Is this justice?

According to Universalism God shortened the lives of the men of Sodom and removed them prematurely, or rather by a fortunate providence, to the abodes of the blessed. At the same time he prolonged the existence of the faithful Lot, under the most painful circumstances. The unhappy man survived the destruction, or rather the salvation of his daughters, the mournful, or rather the happy end of his wavering wife, the loss of his property and the ruin of his town. Was it an equitable procedure to transfer the vile inmates of that polluted city from earth to heaven, while the aged Lot was left to roam in desolation and grief, a wanderer on earth?

Was it just to doom the favored Israelites to a prolonged life amid the burning sands of the desert, while the pursuers, the Egyptian host, were relieved from the work of malignant persecution and transferred to heaven? In a few minutes the latter were drowned, and then their happiness was complete—for forty years the Israelites bore the sufferings of a sojourn in the desert.

Let a man serve God with pious care, and in ordinary circumstances, he will outlive the abandoned voluptuary. His piety will be rewarded by a long exclusion from the joys of heaven. He must stay on earth till he has seen his fondest hopes crushed a hundred times; he must endure separations that will wring his heart; he must live till he becomes an incumbrance to his friends, till he stands a solitary trunk, stripped of its branches; bowing and trembling under every blast; he must endure neglect; he must witness the unconcealed avidity of eager heirs to gain possession of his property; perhaps he outlives his reason and remains a helpless wreck, and his dotage exhausts the patience of all around him. At last death removes the superannuated burden from the world.

Let a profligate young man run into vicious excesses. In a fit of ebriation, or in the hope of concealing crime, he commits a murder; the laws of the land doom him to die. Or, in other words, a kind providence thus favors him with a speedier discharge from the woes of earth. Instead of dragging out a long life, he is borne to heaven, ere he has attained mature age. He is blessed with an earlier release from the perils and vicissitudes of earth than the pious man. But where is the equity of this procedure? In all such instances Universalism charges the Almighty with a flagrant disregard of justice.

We do not affirm that the righteous always outlive the wicked, but when they do, the fact furnishes ground for the charge of partiality, upon the principles of Universalism.

ART. III. *Missionary Intelligence—Madagascar.*

The only intelligence we have lately received from this interesting field of Christian labors and sufferings, comes to us in the Boston Daily Advertiser, from Cape of Good Hope papers to October 10. These papers contain extracts from the letters of a Missionary and several native converts in Madagascar, and also a narrative of the cruel persecutions under which these converts are suffering. We give the abridged account furnished by the Advertiser.

It appears that this persecution is carried on under the express orders of the Queen. The person first sentenced to death was a woman named Rafaravavy. But one of her companions, Rasalama, spoke so boldly in defence of Christianity, that she incurred the anger of the Queen, and was ordered to be put to death. She was severely flogged for several days successively, before she was put to death. She however continued steadfast in her faith, to the end, and met death with calmness and tranquillity. Her companions were valued and sold, and their property confiscated. About a month after, Rafaravavy was informed that the wrath of the Queen had abated, since the death of Rasalama, and that her irons might be taken off. She was however placed among those reduced to perpetual slavery.

After this the remaining Christians began to assemble in the night, at the house of Rafaralahy, where they read together the words of eternal

life, conversed together on spiritual things, and united in prayer and praise. This indulgence continued but a short time. They were betrayed to the government, Rafaralahy was put in irons, and every effort was made to extort from him the names of his companions. But he remained inflexible in his resolution not to betray his friends. After being kept in irons two or three days, he was taken to the place of execution and speared to death. The calmness with which he met his death made a deep impression on the minds of his executioners. He spoke to them on his way to the place of execution, of Jesus Christ, and how happy he felt at the thought of seeing in a few minutes Him who loved him and died for him. At the place of execution, a few moments being granted him at his request, he offered up a fervent prayer for his persecuted brethren, and commended his soul to Jesus. He then with perfect composure, laid himself down, and was immediately put to death. He was 25 years of age, and of a respectable family. He was not baptized, and did not take a prominent part in the promotion of Christianity, until after the commencement of the persecutions.

After this execution, the persecution was pressed with still greater rigor. The government determined, if possible, to secure all the companions of Rafaralahy. Several of them were seized, and afterwards made their escape. Many incidents, showing the distress to which the Christians were reduced, are related. A large number were obliged to conceal themselves in the houses of their friends, some in the forests, numbers were sold to slavery, and some were in irons. The Queen proposed to the chief officers to put every one of the Christians to death—to destroy completely all the roots, that no sprout might spring up hereafter. But some of her officers advised her against this, saying, “it is the nature of the religion of the whites, the more you kill the more the people will receive it.” Six of the Christians, finding there was no means of safety in the island, unless they renounced their religion, were endeavoring to make their escape. But this it was difficult to accomplish. A plan was concerted, however, by which it was hoped they would effect their escape to Mauritius.

ART. IV. Notices.

The Review published in the present No. has excluded almost all other matter. It is of greater length than was anticipated. If any other *apology* for its insertion be required than what is stated in the introduction to it, it may be found in the fact, that we have of late been called upon from different sections of our church, to vindicate her judicatories from the foul aspersions cast upon them by the editor of the Magazine. We have been told that, as the professed organ of the Associate church, she claimed this service at our hands; that some of her members were shamefully imposed upon; that there was danger of the mischief increasing unless met by the application of a suitable remedy; that we must not be contented to deal in *generals*, but must condescend to *particulars*, &c. &c. Hence, much as this kind of business is repugnant to our feelings, a necessity has been laid upon us to write and publish the aforesaid Review. We could indeed have gladly drawn a veil over the “multitude of sins” which we have exposed, had such a course been consistent with the claims of truth, the interests of a much abused church, and a sense of duty. We hope that if again called on to notice these disagreeable matters, we shall be enabled to use greater brevity.

☞ The Communications and *Letters* lying on hand will all be attended to as soon as practicable—perhaps in the next number.

CONTENTS.

	page.		page.
Am. I. A Review of the Associate Pres- byterian Magazine.....	335	Am. III. Missionary Intelligence—Mish- ganar.....	431
Am. II. Partiality of God.....	430	Am. IV. Notices.....	428

New subscribers can be furnished with the present (the XV) volume from the beginning.

Persons wishing the XIV volume can be supplied with the same at half price.

Those subscribers who are in debt for the XIV, or any previous volume, are requested to make payment with all convenient speed. Letters enclosing \$5.00 or more, may be sent at our expense and risk.

JAMES MARTIN.

Receipts during the month of January by Mail.

Rev. J. C. Bruce,.....\$20 00

☞ All persons having in their possession the names of subscribers to the **DISCOURSES AND BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES**, proposed to be published by Rev. J. P. Miller, will please forward them immediately either to him or the Rev. J. Martin.

CONFSSION OF FAITH; the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, with the scriptural proofs at large, new edition, just published by order of the Synod of the Associate Church of North America. For sale by **JAMES HENRY, 71 State-street, Albany.**

AGENTS.

In addition to the ministers and itinerating preachers of the Associate Church, who are authorized to receive subscriptions and money, and give receipts, the following persons are authorized to act as special agents:

Peter McArthur, Cambridge, Washington Co., N. Y.

A. Bishop, Argyle, Washington Co. N. Y.

Alex. Galley, Clark's Ferry, Perry Co., Pa.

Wm. McMinn, Potter's Mills, Centre Co., Pa.

Andrew Graham, Baltimore, Md.

Andrew Harro, Canonsburg, Pa.

Rev. Samuel Wilson, Xenia, Ohio.

James Gordon, Fortia, Livingston Co. N. Y.

Rev. James Rogers, Pittsburgh, Pa.

The's Cambridge, Putnam, Wash's Co. N. Y.

James Wilson, Esq., Fawn Grove, York Co. Pa.

Alexander W. Brewster, Erie, Pa.

James Hestabrook, Esq., New London Cross Roads, Chester Co. Pa.

John Smith, P. M., Pleasant Run, Carroll Co., Indiana.

John Anderson, Huntingdon, Pa.

William S. Young, 173 Race-street, Philadelphia.

R. G. Chambers, P. M., Columbia, Ben. Co., Ill.

The **Reasonable Monitor** is published monthly, at \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance.